FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 189

28 September 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

'Eyewitnesses' Report Seeing Cruise Launcher in UK AA 1
USSR Scientist Condemns U.S. Missile Intentions AA 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Soviets Continue To Hit Reagan's UN Speech CC 1
'Clumsy Attempt' to Misinform CC 1
'Slander' Against USSR [Soltan] CC 2
Reagan's 'Sincerity' Questioned CC 3
[Bogachev]
Reagan Speech, USSR Initiatives CC 4
U.S. 'Behavior' at UN Subject of Soviet Comment CC 6
'Fails' To Meet Commitment CC 6
[Kondrashov]
Lichenstein Remarks Berated CC 7
[Soldatov in IZVESTIYA 21 Sep]
USSR Pushes Peaceful Use of Space Treaty at UN CC 8
[Zubkov]
Commentator Discusses Geneva Talks, UN, Lebanon CC 8
[Glukhov in PRAVDA 25 Sep]
Gandhi Addresses Nonaligned Meeting at UN CC 13
Reagan 'Invites Himself' as Nonaligned Leader CC 13
[Zaytsev]
International TU Conference Opens in Moscow CC 14

KAL INCIDENT

U.S. Accused of Hampering KAL Debris Hunters DD 1
[Petrov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Sep]
U.S. Reaction to KAL Incident Reported DD 2
[Palladin in IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Peace Talk, 'Militarist Obsession' Viewed A 1
[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]
U.S. 'Mulling Over' Increasing Troops in Lebanon A 2
[Pakhomov]
Reagan Signs Military Appropriations Bill A 3
[Seyful-Mulyukov]
Weinberger Seen Paving Way for Reagan in Asia A 3
[Fedorov]
VOA Deputy Chief Accused of Spying in Moscow A 4
[Ponomarev in IZVESTIYA 27 Sep]

CHINA

Moscow TV Notes Talks Between Weinberger, Zhang [Seyful-Mulyukov] B 1

SOUTH ASIA

Pakistan Unrest Blamed on U.S. 'Vital Interests' [Korolev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Sep] D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Gromyko, PRK's Hun Sen Banquet Speeches Cited [SPK] E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

CSSR's Chnoupek Meets With Gromyko in Moscow F 1
Joint Communique Issued F 1
[PRAVDA 28 Sep]
Gromyko, Chnoupek Speak F 3
Meetings Reported F 5
CSSR Journalists Interview Chnoupek F 6
[Prague]
Chnoupek Departs Moscow F 7

WESTERN EUROPE

British, French Role in NATO Nuclear Tally Seen G 1
[Maslennikov in PRAVDA 21 Sep]
Finland's Koivisto Cited on Talks With Reagan G 3
Austrian Pilots Reject Boycott of Moscow Flights G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Rattling 'Fistful of Arms' in Lebanon H 1
[Kondrashov]
U.S.-NATO 'Military Fist' Hangs Over Lebanon H 2
[Seyful-Mulyukov]
Syrian Subunits Asked To Stay, 'Maintain Peace' H 3
[Zubkov]
Mubarak's Visit to France, U.S. Previewed H 3
Moscow Meeting Honors Egypt's President An-Nasir H 4
USSR, Tunisian Foreign Ministry Aides Confer H 4
[IZVESTIYA 24 Sep]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Mozambique Rebels Reportedly Release Two Soviets J 1
[AFP]
CPSU Message on Death of South Africa's Dadoo J 1
[PRAVDA 22 Sep]
Nigerian Trade Union Members Visit Baku J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

'Creative Discussion' Crucial in Party Meetings R 1
[Editorial in PRAVDA 26 Sep]
Grishin Attends Moscow City Soviet Session R 2
Kapitonov Meets With Workers in Ivanovo Oblast R 3
PRAVDA Decries Pitfalls of Consumerism R 3
[Petrov, 19 Sep]
Tambov Oblast Consumer Services Under Fire R 5
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Sep]
Latvian Sentenced for 'Antistate' Activity R 6

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Political Observer's Talk on Technical Progress S 1
Briefs: Ship for Greece; Equipment Show in Kiev S 6

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Mid-September Weather, Crop Status Reviewed T 1
[Sakharova in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 24 Sep]
'Major Victory' in Kuybyshev Grain Delivery T 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Chemical Industry Minister on Development Plans U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Military Council's Shevkun Speaks on Propaganda V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Sep]
Marshal Petrov Interviewed on Tank Troops Day V 1
[PRAVDA 11 Sep]

'EYEWITNESSES' REPORT SEEING CRUISE LAUNCHER IN UK

LD280709 Moscow TASS in English 0649 GMT 28 Sep 83

[Text] London September 28 TASS -- The United States and the British Conservative Government are speeding up the implementation of the programme for the deployment of new American first-strike nuclear missiles on the British soil. According to the information at the disposal of the participants in the peace tent camp near the Greenham Common military base (Berkshire County), the first cruise missile launcher was brought there the other day. Means of transportation and escort trucks with the identification marks of the U.S. Air Force, the newspaper GUARDIAN quotes eyewitnesses as saying, have brought to the base miscellaneous equipment, including a cruise missile launcher. The first batch of "cruise death" is to be stationed in Greenham Common in December this year.

The British Defence Department has refused either to confirm or deny the statement by the participants in the anti-war movement.

The London press pointed out earlier that a special team of servicemen arrived at Greenham Common base early in summer to service the American missiles and be included into the launching crews.

USSR SCIENTIST CONDEMNS U.S. MISSILE INTENTIONS

LD271417 Moscow TASS in English 1029 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS -- "Deployment of new nuclear missiles aiming at the USSR reveals the background of the intentions of the U.S. Administration -- to unleash a nuclear war against the Soviet Union from the territory of Western Europe", a TASS correspondent has been told by a well-known Soviet radio biologist Aleksandr Kuzin. The scientist has recently returned from the 33rd Pugwash Conference the theme of which was "prevention of nuclear and other war and termination of the arms race." It was attended by scientists from 36 countries.

The question of consequences of deployment of American missiles in Western Europe was one of the main [as received] at the meeting, Kuzin stressed. Scientists noted the insolvency, the falsity of the stand of the U.S. Administration which, insisting on deployment of new missiles in Western Europe, tries to attribute that to the need of protecting "national security" of those countries.

"But European peoples are becoming more clearly aware that deployment on their territory of new nuclear weapons with the button to operate them in the United States does not enhance their security but on the contrary leads to destabilization of the situation in that part of the globe", said the scientist.

"I believe that it is the duty of every scientist to make his contribution to prevention of a nuclear war. Therefore, my colleagues, participants in the Pugwash movement, and me, are using every opportunity to explain to the public the whole danger of a nuclear threat, the need of stopping the nuclear arms race," he said.

"To me as a radio biologist, who knows well the perfidious effects of radiation, who visited Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is clear that as a result of nuclear-weapon explosions more than half of the population of the globe will immediately die, 70-90 percent of the key industries will be put out of action. In a brief period of time, the scientist explained, irradiation of the whole population might reach 500 rads. According to geneticists, even a lesser dose of irradiation leads to genetic degeneration of mankind."

SOVIETS CONTINUE TO HIT REAGAN'S UN SPEECH

'Clumsy Attempt' to Misinform

LD271536 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 27 Sep 83

["Hypocrisy Again" -- TASS headline]

[Text] New York September 27 TASS -- President Ronald Reagan made in the United Nations a speech in which he tried to prove what could not be proved, namely that his administration policy of building up tension, stepping up the arms race and preparations for war was in accord with the lofty aims and principles of the U.N. Charter and the interests of "peace". He resorted to a gross distortion of well-known facts, outright deception and demagogy -- means to match his unseemly aims.

Speaking of the United States professed love of peace Reagan pretended to be deploring the increased use of violence in Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and other regions which, he said, have become the arena of confrontation between the great powers. He singled out such countries as Lebanon, Chad, El Salvador and some others. But is it not Washington that is kindling fires in these countries in an effort to impose on the peoples of these countries, by force of arms, a political set-up suitable to the USA? The increased use of violence, about which Reagan pharisaically talks, is first of all, the result of "undertakings" of the American Administration which has elevated violence to the rank of a national policy.

According to the Brookings Institution, in the last six years the American Administration resorted to armed actions and threatened to use force on 38 occasions.

The President's speech reflected the irritation felt by Washington over the widening chasm between the USA and the Nonaligned Movement. This is the only way to explain allegations that those of the non-aligned countries which are following a policy unsuitable to Washington have "lost their independence." Reagan obviously follows in the footsteps of John Foster Dulles who openly called the Nonaligned Movement "immoral".

As to the assurances concerning Washington "dedication to the aims and charter of the United Nations", they looked rather like a clumsy attempt to justify public attacks by official American representatives, including the President himself, on this international organization. It seems appropriate in this connection to recall the statement made by the U.S. delegate in the United Nations and supported by the President, suggesting that those of the U.N. member-countries who are displeased with Washington's actions, may clear out of the USA.

In a deliberately vague form, keeping things back and making omissions, the President outlined the "new" instructions which he gave to the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe. According to him, the notorious "zero option" proposing the liquidation of all Soviet medium-range missiles all over the territory of the USSR but not envisaging the liquidation of a single unit of corresponding nuclear armaments of NATO is "the best, fairest, most practical solution to this problem."

As follows from the explanations of the White House there have been no changes in the United States position on not including Britain's and France's nuclear armaments in the overall balance of the forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The United States also continues insisting on its "right" to deploy in Western Europe under any conditions its "Pershing" missiles and cruise missiles capable of hitting targets in the Soviet Union.

Thus, the United States "sensational concessions" at the talks about which the Western press has been clamouring for several days now proved to be the same propaganda game and nothing more.

The President did not say a word why Washington is not satisfied with the Soviet proposals according to which both sides would give up the deployment of any new nuclear medium-range systems in Europe and would reduce the number of their missiles, aircraft and warheads on the European Continent to absolutely equal levels.

The President grossly distorted the facts when he alleged that the Soviet Union "declines to accept the total elimination" of medium-range nuclear weapons. It is well known that it is precisely the Soviet side that remains ready for a truly zero variant according to which Europe would be rid completely of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. Meanwhile Washington refuses even to consider this Soviet proposal.

The President continued insisting on disrupting the existing parity of the sides also in the sphere of strategic armaments by destroying above all ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union which constitute the backbone of the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear forces.

Thus, Reagans "peaceable" rhetoric is actually nothing more than the verbiage which camouflages Washington's real aims of the unrestrained buildup of the United States armaments designed for conducting nuclear war.

The President in his speech slandered again the Soviet Union. In a manner unworthy of a leader of a state, he tried to ascribe to the Soviet Union the responsibility for the outcome of the provocation with the South Korean plane, a provocation planned and staged by American special services.

On the whole Reagan's speech was a new clumsy attempt to misinform public opinion and to mask the aggressive imperialistic essence of U.S. foreign policy. But such attempts can hardly mislead anyone, Americans included. It was not accidental that during Reagan's speech a public demonstration took place outside the U.N. building in protest against the White House's dangerous policy which is pushing the world toward a nuclear catastrophe.

'Slander' Against USSR

LD271423 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] The current session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York has been addressed by President Ronald Reagan. Here is what Radio Moscow News analyst Yuriy Soltan writes:

A lot of publicity preceded the speech in which the President himself took an active part. In a statement over the Voice of America on Saturday he promised to tell the world something exceedingly important. However, the delegates of the General Assembly heard nothing really new. The same old words that peace is better than war, the same assurances that there is not a country in the world more devoted to peace than the United States. There was a weighty portion of slander in his speech against the Soviet Union, and there were irritative complaints that the nonaligned nations failed to understand the policy of the United States, and that instead of praising that policy they often sharply criticise it.

And why should there be praise for the present policy of Washington? Under the Reagan administration the United States feels free to scrap important treaties and agreements, to start a mad arms race on the sea, land and in space, through the policy of sanctions to try and punish countries that are not to its liking, to interfere in the internal affairs of Nicaragua, Lebanon and other countries, to work out doctrines of aggressive wars and to plan the first use of nuclear weapons.

And there was nothing in President Reagan's speech that would indicate a departure of the United States from the policy of planting a nuclear mine under the relaxation of tension and peaceful cooperation. It was with affected dramatism that Mr Reagan presented the so-called new proposals of the United States which are supposed to break the deadlock over the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and reducing strategic arsenals. In reality, however, even a casual look at those proposals shows that nothing has changed in United States' approach to the talks. It continues to be against the principle of equality and equal security. It still wants to upset the military-strategic parity and to try and obtain at the talks the so-called right for itself and NATO to military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as well as over all other countries.

I would describe President Reagan's so-called modified plan at the talks, in fact his entire speech, as a propaganda trick, and it has one objective, that is to beat down the wave of the antiwar movement, disorientate the public and, by claiming that the Soviet Union refuses to accept America's so-called flexible stand, to bring United States first-strike nuclear weapons to Western Europe. Now does Washington really believe that the people will be assessing United States policy by the demagogic pronouncements of the administration's top officials? Statements about peaceful intentions should be backed by deeds, and verbal camouflage is unable to cover up the present dangerous course of Washington which is pushing the world to nuclear catastrophe.

Reagan's 'Sincerity' Questioned

LD271659 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 27 Sep 83

["It Takes Not Words, but Actions" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

There was a time when the present U.S. President Ronald Reagan could permit himself to feel at home in any audience. He took delight in telling old jokes to venerable scientists, muddled up proper and geographical names at diplomatic receptions, embarrassed professional military at the Pentagon by his "knowledge" of rocketry.

For a time he could get away with anything. But when the President began frankly sharing with the audience his views that a limited nuclear war is thinkable, his closest aides began sounding alarm.

Reagan's revelations, his inability to assess the situation soberly and take sensible decisions began to cause international rows and dismayed even most pro-American minded West European politicians.

As the Western press reports, Reagan's closest aides took under careful control President's preparations for public statements. They have, of course, been unable to eliminate the gaps in their chief's range of vision, nor to soften the ideological harshness of the President's public speeches. Yet they have succeeded in some respects.

Credit should be given to President Reagan, too. In his latest address at the United Nations Organization he no longer mistook the U.N. General Assembly for the Republican Party conference of 1980, where he could openly speculate on the U.S. plans for ensuring military superiority over the socialist countries. He had to take into account the fact that the U.N. is no meeting of members of the American Legion, where one can convince the audience that the way to disarmament lies through a build-up of the U.S. nuclear might. Reagan very much astonished the audience at the U.N. General Assembly session by having used the word detente without an abusive epithet for the first time in ten years.

The U.S. President has gone even farther. He solemnly proclaimed from the rostrum of the United Nations Organization that a nuclear war cannot be won, it cannot be waged in general.

The question arises whether this statement by Reagan means a cardinal change in Washington's doctrine, or it is simply a propaganda insert by the President's advisers, who are trying to face-lift the present administration in the eyes of the international organization? Alas, the facts call in question the sincerity of this statement by the President. The U.S. Administration is categorically refusing, as before, to follow the Soviet Union's example and commit itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In building up its armed force, Washington continues laying its main emphasis on the production and deployment of first strike nuclear weapons -- MX, Trident-2, and other missiles. Apparently, the USA does not intend to give up the NATO's "flexible response" doctrine, which is based on the first use of nuclear weapons.

To dispel the doubts of the world public about the real precepts of the present U.S. Administration as regards nuclear war, it takes not words, but actions.

Reagan Speech, USSR Initiatives

LD280340 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Addressing the session of the United Nations General Assembly on Monday President Reagan tried to blame the Soviet Union for the lack of progress at the Geneva talks on reducing the medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe. Valentin Petrov explains if this attempt by the President to lay the blame at someone else's door can be justified.

Over the two years of the Geneva talks the Soviet Union has advanced quite a few initiatives, they range from the proposal for a complete renunciation of nuclear arms in Europe, both medium-range and tactical, to a readiness to bring about a partial nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union proposed in particular that each of the confronting sides in Europe should have no more than 162 medium-range missiles and 138 nuclear capable aircraft.

The American side raised three main objections to Soviet initiatives. First, to make account not in the number of delivery vehicles, but in the number of warheads on missiles. Second, nuclear weapons must not be redeployed from the zone covered by the talks, but must be destroyed on the spot. And, third, Washington refused to take into account at the talks the nuclear weapons of Britain and France targeted on the Soviet Union. Guided by the desire to do everything possible for reaching a mutually acceptable agreement, the Soviet Union demonstrated its flexible approach in Geneva. It agreed to negotiate a parity on medium-range nuclear missiles both in the number of delivery vehicles and the warheads. So the first objection of the American side was taken off the agenda. At the end of last month the Soviet Union clarified its position on the fate of nuclear arms subject to cuts.

Should a mutually acceptable agreement be reached, including a renunciation by the United States of the deployment of new missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union would be ready to reduce the medium-range missiles in its European part up to a level equal to the number of missiles that Britain and France have, and would destroy all the missiles subject to cuts. In the event of this, a considerable number of most modern missiles, known in the West as SS-20 missiles, would be eliminated.

It seemed that the Soviet Union did all it could to make the reaching of an agreement at the talks possible. Yet, while the Soviet Union was developing its position, and fewer and fewer excuses remained for delaying the talks, Washington began to put to the foreground more and more the demand for not taking the British and French nuclear forces into account.

Theirs are national deterrent means, it claimed. But the Soviet Union's medium-range missiles are also means of national defense, they are national deterrent means. They are means of protection of the Soviet Union and its allies from the attack of the West. The situation as you may see is absolutely identical. The refusal to take the British and French nuclear forces into account would lead to the creation in the given class of weapons, which are strategic weapons in relation to the Soviet Union, since they present an immediate threat to the Soviet Union's territory, of a considerable disbalance in favor of NATO. The rufusal to count these means would open already now a new channel through which NATO would be able to ensure for itself a considerable nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. Consequently a new nuclear threat would emerge for the security of the Soviet Union and its allies.

It is most unlikely that officials of the American Administration responsible for the Geneva talks are not aware of this. It is most unlikely that they do not remember that should military operations break out Britain will place her nuclear force at the disposal of the United States. It is no secret that France's nuclear weapons are targeted on the Soviet Union. When the defense secretary considers the NATO nuclear force in his annual report he always takes the nuclear force of Britain and France into account. As the Congressional Research Service group pointed out in a special report recently, even the daily targeting of British nuclear missiles is now carried out in coordination with target distribution plans of the Strategic Air Force command of the United States. About France it is said that she must come to the help of any NATO members.

Why does the United States demonstrate such an inflexible approach at the talks in Geneva? This can only be explained by the unwillingness of the American Administration to reach a genuine agreement in Geneva and by the desire to deploy American new missiles in Europe at whatever cost. President Reagan's speech at the General Assembly serves as one more confirmation of that. But if the situation reaches the point when the deployment of new American missiles starts in Europe the Soviet Union will, naturally, take countermeasures to preserve the balance of forces, both on a regional and a global scale. There should be no misunderstanding on this score. The military parity will be preserved as a result but at a considerably higher level of nuclear confrontation.

No one is obviously going to benefit from this situation -- on the contrary, all, including the Americans, will find themselves at the losing end. New missiles will add security to no one. It can be ensured only if a genuine mutually acceptable agreement is signed. Thanks to the Soviet Union's efforts there is now every opportunity for doing that. Now it is up to Washington to show its goodwill, though so far it stubbornly refuses to demonstrate it.

U.S. 'BEHAVIOR' AT UN SUBJECT OF SOVIET COMMENT

'Fails' To Meet Commitment

LD272211 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Sep 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Excerpts] Events can be divided into those that can be anticipated and those that are unexpected. The opening of the latest, 38th, UN General Assembly session in New York on Tuesday, 20 September, is among the events that can be anticipated and are fairly important.

The Soviet Union intends to actively conduct its struggle against the threat of war at this session of the General Assembly. In particular, the Soviet Government has proposed that the following question be included in the agenda: concluding a treaty on a ban on using force in space and from space to Earth. The militarization of space and a further terrible round of the arms race must not be allowed.

The beginning of the UN General Assembly session belongs to the anticipated events, but who would have thought that on the eve of the session and during the first days of its work a question which is not even on the agenda should become very critical. This question is about the behavior of the country on whose territory the UN headquarters stands, and also the behavior of the U.S. Government and U.S. authorities.

Following the incident with the South Korean plane, the Reagan administration, as is known, banned any activity by Aeroflot in the United States, and when accord was reached about special Aeroflot flights to bring the delegations of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Belorussian SSR to New York for the UN General Assembly session, further obstacles were erected by the governors of two U.S. states -- New York and New Jersey. Having colluded with each other and, one must suppose, with the White House, they announced that the international airports around New York would be closed, even for special Aeroflot flights.

The U.S. authorities also failed to give a guarantee that the security of the head of the USSR delegation would be ensured. Thus the decision was made that Andrey Gromyko's trip to New York was impossible, as has already been reported. For the first time in many, many years, the head of the Soviet delegation will not take direct part in the work of the General Assembly session.

And once more, in a very acute form, the question arises as to whether the United States is an appropriate country in which to base the UN headquarters. The point is not the inflamed anti-Soviet passions existing at present in Washington, but that the United States should meet its international commitments and yet fails to do so. There is a special agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the location for the UN headquarters. It was signed on 26 June 1947 by the UN secretary general and the then U.S. secretary of state.

Our relations with the United States, especially now, are, let us be frank, poor. But this in no way frees the U.S. Government from its commitments to the United Nations. Obligations should be observed irrespective of relations. This question was discussed at an urgent meeting of the UN Committee for Liaison With the Host Country. The Soviet position was supported by a series of delegates at the committee as well as by the world public.

How did the Americans react to criticism? In a scandalous way. You know about this. Lichenstein, U.S. deputy permanent representative to the United Nations made a statement of unprecedented impudence. He said that if the UN member countries consider that they are insufficiently well hosted in the United States they should think about leaving and transferring the UN headquarters from U.S. territory. Americans will not hinder this, said the impudent Mr Lichenstein. On the contrary, they would come to the dock in order to see them off -- that is the representatives of other states at the United Nations -- when they sail from U.S. shores in the rays of the setting sun, as he expressed.

The statement aroused such a protest that the American representative at the United Nations was forced to explain that Mr Lichenstein should, I quote, be interpreted in a broader context. Precisely. In a broader context, in the context of the whole imperial and arrogant policy of the present U.S. Administration. This context also includes a high-handed attitude to the United Nations. Incidentally, Mr Lichenstein met with support in the U.S. Senate. In the latest surge of chauvinistic feelings, the Senate, by 66 votes to 23, adopted an amendment proposing a sharp cut in the regular contribution of the United States to the UN budget.

Lichenstein Remarks Berated

PM271337 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Soldatov report: "Rudeness Instead of Arguments. In the UN Committee on Relations With the Host Country"]

[Text] New York -- U.S. Representative C. Lichenstein spoke no less than five times at the session of the UN Committee on Relations With the Host Country, which is supposed to monitor the fulfillment of the agreement between the world organization and the United States on the status of the UN headquarters. And almost each time he used expressions which it is customary to term unparliamentary. What is it that so aroused the American representative?

The committee assembled to debate the question of the U.S. Government's crude breach of its obligations to the United Nations, exemplified in its refusal to admit the Aeroflot plane carrying the Soviet delegation to New York airports. This unprecendented action by Washington has made it impossible for the head of the Soviet delegation -- A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister -- to travel to the 38th session of the UN General Assembly.

The agreement on the UN headquarters indicates that federal, state, and local authorities are not to obstruct passage into or out of the area of the central UN institutions by member country representatives. The agreement also indicates that the U.S. authorities must grant delegation members the requisite protection during their entry into the area of the central institutions. The United States, the committee's Soviet representative noted, is breaking the spirit and the letter of this agreement.

The refusal to admit the plane carrying the Soviet delegation on the eve of a routine UN General Assembly session is not the United States' only crude breach of its agreement with the world organization. The Glen Cove residence of the permanent Soviet representative at the United Nations was attacked on 4 September this year. Attention is also drawn by the anti-Soviet campaign being conducted by local newspapers and on television and radio. Officials, from the U.S. President down, are actively participating in this campaign and are essentially its inspirers. The U.S. Government's patent breach of the agreement on the UN headquarters was mentioned by representatives of other countries.

But when speaking in the committee the American representative substituted rudeness for arguments. As he portrayed it, the refusal to allow the plane carrying the Soviet delegation to land at New York airfields looked almost like a model of U.S. observance of its international obligations.

Moreover, he cynically declared that the U.S. Government will not object should the UN headquarters move to another country.

USSR PUSHES PEACEFUL USE OF SPACE TREATY AT UN

LD272251 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 27 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Georgiy Zubkov]

[Excerpts] General political debates have begun at the 38th United Nations General Assembly session.

Our country is in favor of a peaceful cosmos. We have always come out for space being for the benefit of mankind, and the Soviet Union has presented for examination at the present UN General Assembly session a draft treaty on banning the use of force in outer space, and in space with relation to the earth. This is a very important and very timely document. It is well known that the U.S. Administration and the Pentagon are striving to achieve military superiority, not only on earth but in space. A special space command functions in the United States. Proposals have even been voiced to rename the Air Force the Space Force. He who can control space, said a highly-ranking U.S. military department official, will be able to hold the whole of the earth in his sights.

According to BUSINESS WEEK magazine, the United States has spent over $50 billion on military space programs in 20 years. The Pentagon envisages the creation of military satellites and military space stations in a near-earth orbit, equipping them with lasers and other types of armaments, and the deployment in space of antisatellite weapons. Flights of manned reusable "shuttle" spacecraft are also being linked with the militarization of space. Over 100 of these flights are planned over 10 years. Some 450 nonreusable military spacecraft are planned to be launched over a 5-year period. Space, said a USAF space systems director, is the modern equivalent of heights over which military leaders have been striving for centuries to gain control in order to use them to achieve military superiority.

Discussion of questions connected with space at the present UN General Assembly, and the acceptance of the Soviet proposal on a ban on the use of force in outer space and in space with relation to the earth can become a vital obstacle to the militarization of outer space

COMMENTATOR DISCUSSES GENEVA TALKS, UN, LEBANON

PM271529 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 83 First Edition p 4

[Yuriy Glukhov "International Review"]

[Text] Tocsin of Peace

On 20 September a tocsin was heard on a lawn in front of the UN building in New York. That was the symbolic beginning to International Peace Day, held on a UN initiative.

The chimes of the bell were echoed by the powerful rolls of thunder from peace champions' demonstrations. They swept across many countries and continents. "Stop the nuclear arms race!"; "No to the new nuclear missile weapons in Europe!"; "Put an end to nuclear madness!" the peoples demanded. The fall antiwar offensive has acquired a new scale.

The main source of dangerous international tension is the aggressive policy of the most reactionary forces of the United States and some other Western countries. Their policy is aimed at hiking the arms race and achieving superiority, with the aid of which they would like to impose their will on the world. The U.S. plans to deploy new nuclear missiles in West Europe are a particular danger.

The deployment of these weapons not far from Soviet borders would mean a sharp disruption of the approximate equilibrium of forces between West and East. It would mean a substantial intensification of the threat of war, and not only for the Soviet people and their allies. After all, Washington is propagandizing the idea of the possibility and virtual admissibility of nuclear war, and West Europeans would in fact become hostages to Washington's adventurist policy. The few minutes U.S. missiles take to reach their targets scarecely leave a possibility of preventing a conflict which could also arise as a result of a subjective human error or technical flaw, the danger of which increases with the growth in the number of weapons. It is no accident that three-fourths of the FRG population, four-fifths of the Belgian population, and the overwhelming majority of inhabitants of other Western European states oppose the U.S. nuclear plans.

The socialist community countries are doing everything incumbent on them to help overcome the menacing trends in the development of world events. They put foremost in their international activity the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe -- the most burning of the problems facing all mankind.

Soviet people's desire for peace, the curbing of the arms race, and the consolidation of the people's security were convincingly re-expressed in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's reply to a group of FRG Bundestag Social Democratic deputies, which generated a broad international response. "The world does not need an increase in arsenals of lethal armaments," Yu. V. Andropov noted. "It needs a radical reduction in these armaments and the use of the funds thus released for the urgent needs of economic and social development.

"That is the firm conviction of the Soviet Union. That is the viewpoint of all Warsaw Pact states."

The USSR suggests freezing quantitatively and qualitatively all nuclear armaments, that is stopping the quantitative buildup of all components of nuclear arsenals and not developing new types and forms of nuclear weapons but introducing a moratorium on conducting tests of all nuclear warheads and the testing of new types of forms of nuclear weapon delivery.

To make Europe, and with it the whole world, safe from the nuclear threat, the Soviet Union has suggested ridding Europe entirely of any nuclear weapons -- both medium-range and tactical. If this is unsuitable we are prepared, under conditions of reciprocity, to reduce medium-range nuclear armaments and leave behind in our European territory only as many missiles of this type as Britain and France have in their possession. The USSR advocates the party of the two military-political groupings in Europe in terms of missiles, aircraft, and warheads, and at the lowest possible level.

The Soviet Union recently took a major new step in the interests of reaching an accord. It agreed to liquidate all the missiles reduced in the European part of the country. This good-will step means refusing to rebase the reduced medium-range missiles from the European part of the USSR to the Asian part. Of course, this would be done if a mutually acceptable agreement is reached on the problem of nuclear arms in Europe as a whole, including the United States' renunciation of the deployment of its new missiles, and a corresponding reduction in medium-range aircraft. At the talks with the United States in Geneva, the Soviet Union is prepared to translate its proposals immediately into the language of treaty commitments and to implement them subsequently, step by step, in their entirety.

The cause of the defense of peace finds a firm basis in the strengthening coordination of the socialist countries' actions in all fields. This was discussed at the conference of Central Committee secretaries of the socialist countries' fraternal parties for international and ideological questions held in Moscow 20 September. The participants in the conference stressed the need to reveal profoundly and comprehensively the point and meaning of the socialist states' peace initiatives and drew attention to the importance of joint or parallel actions by all socialist countries for limiting and reducing arms, strengthening peace and the peoples' security, and expanding dialogue between various political and social forces aware of the reality of the threat of a nuclear conflict.

The enemies of peace are not only laying down their arms. They are resorting to ever new acts of provocation. While their recent tool and victim was the South Korean passenger aircraft, this week the United Nations has been in their sights.

On 20 September the 38th UN General Assembly [UNGA] session began work in New York. Delegations from 157 countries are taking part. In contravention of its international commitments, the United States has prevented the arrival in New York of the Soviet delegation which was to have been headed by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister.

"An attack on the United Nations" was how the Indian newspaper THE PATRIOT described the U.S. actions. The course chosen by the Reagan administration, it writes, only increases the danger to peace and does not make it recede. To all appearances the United States has now organized an attack against the United Nations because Washington is no longer succeeding in dictating its will to that international organization.

The reasons for Washington's obstructionist stance with respect to the United Nations can be explained. The main place on the session's agenda is occupied by the peace initiatives put forward by the USSR. They are aimed at curbing militarist hysteria, preventing nuclear confrontation, and reducing the danger of war. Unable to set anything against the constructive program of the land of the soviets, the United States wants simply barricade the entrance to the United Nations. The legitimate question arises: Is a country which fails to ensure the necessary conditions for foreign representatives to participate in the work of an international organization a suitable country for the UN headquarters at all?

In fueling cold war hysteria, the United States is sliding increasingly toward a hot war -- toward acts of aggression against other states. Washington is trying to hold back the liberation movement in Central America. The United States is salvaging the puppet junta in El Salvador, stepping up military pressure on Nicaragua, and not ceasing its threat against socialist Cuba. It is waging an undeclared war against democratic Afghanistan. In the Near East, encouraging Israel to continue its aggressive policy, Washington has itself openly embarked on the path of intervention in Lebanon.

Shadow of A Dirty War

During the very hours that the bell of peace was ringing in New York, the Lebanese capital was being shaken by the rolls of artillery shelling. The panic-stricken population of Beirut, as was the case during last year's Israeli bomb attacks, rushed for cover. On the same day the U.S. militarists launched a new phase of their armed intervention in Lebanon's affairs.

Having received Washington's blessing and its permission to use without restriction the fire power of the U.S. 6th Fleet concentrated off Lebanese shores, the Marines lost no time in taking advantage of it. The defenseless civilian cities and villages of Lebanon are now being fired on point-blank as though they were practice targets. A group of U.S. Marines has arrived in Suq al-Gharb in the Lebanese mountains for observation of fire on the spot.

The shadow of a dirty war like the war U.S. imperialism waged in Indochina now looms over Lebanon. Events are developing according to a prerehearsed scheme -- from talk of a "peacekeeping mission" and the dispatch of military specialists to the deployment of a whole armada of interventionist troops. Last year 1,200 Marines from "Rapid Deployment Force" detachments landed on the Lebanese coast. Today their numbers have increased several times over. Not only ships of the 6th fleet with the aircraft carrier "Eisenhower" have been moved up to Lebanon's shores. The battleship "New Jersey" has also been sent.

A year ago Washington swore that the Marines would go home within a month and would in no circumstances conduct combat operations. But now they are drenching Lebanese soil in blood and the deadline for their stay is being extended by a further 18 months.

The U.S. military's actions are synchronized with the actions of the Israeli occupiers, who are seeking to keep south Lebanon. The Lebanese have found themselves between the U.S. hammer and the Israeli anvil. Moreover, the United States' NATO allies are becoming increasingly involved in intervention. As before in Chad, Paris is being increasingly "slotted in" to the U.S. adventure in Lebanon. The French naval squadron headed by the aircraft carrier "Foch" is shelling Beirut and its environs while French aircraft are making operational flights with U.S. aircraft.

Britain has also sent Buccaneer aircraft to Lebanon. Now a British naval task force is being sent there, more powerful than the one sent at the beginning of the Falklands conflict. It includes three British Navy aircraft carriers -- the "Invincible," the "Illustrious," and the "Hermes" -- and five guard frigates, one diesel-powered submarine, the "Opossum," and tankers and transport ships. There are 20 helicopters and about 1,000 marines and support subunits on board the aircraft carriers.

The Lebanese tragedy which is unfolding before the eyes of the whole world is the fruit of American policy. Lebanon, the Beirut newspaper AN-NIDA' notes, is justified in fully holding the United States fully responsible for the catastrophe which the country has been experiencing for the last few years, since there is no doubt that the tragic events occurring here have been planned and provoked by the White House.

Lebanon's fate is an obvious example of how Washington's so-called "peace initiatives" in the Near East turn out. In November 1977 the United States organized President as-Sadat's capitulationist pilgrimage to occupied Jerusalem. In March 1978 Israel carried out a large-scale intervention in Lebanon as a rehearsal for the subsequent aggression.

The Camp David "peace" deal was imposed on Egypt in September 1978, and in April 1982, fulfilling its conditions and withdrawing from Sinai, Tel Aviv handed the liberated Egyptian territory over to... U.S. Marines camouflaged as a "multinational force." The Israeli occupation was replaced by an American one. Having completely secured the Egyptian flank and ensured for themselves the powerful cover of their Washington ally, in June 1982 the Israeli military invaded Lebanon.

Covering up the traces of its participation in the Lebanese massacre and the deaths of thousands of peaceful citizens, both Lebanese and Palestinians, the White House again tried to hide behind the mask of "love for peace." On 1 September 1982 U.S. President Reagan came out with his widely publicized "Near East initiative." And on 16 September the American "peacemakers" let the Israeli military tear West Beirut to pieces, calmly observing the bloody slaughter in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila.

Now we are witnessing the result of yet another "peacemaking" action. Last May Washington and Tel Aviv imposed on Lebanon the so-called "peace agreement." And the reshaping of Lebanon's map began in September. As a result of "redeployment," the Israeli troops are withdrawing to the Awali River line. Tel Aviv is clearing the strategic space for a U.S. invasion, whose scale is constantly expanding.

Moving on from one terrible provocation to another and fanning clashes between different Lebanese communities which have lived in peace for centuries, Washington, together with Tel Aviv, is not just destabilizing Lebanon but is also deliberately and coldbloodedly destroying it and undermining the very foundations of Lebanese statehood and sovereignty.

The violence over Lebanon is the most shameful page in present-day U.S. policy. And the contrivances to which people in the White House resort in an attempt to clean it up. Things have gone as far as the rejection of such obvious facts that even the veteran NEWSWEEK correspondent who interviewed the U.S. President could not contain himself: "It looks like your administration's position is quite inconsistent, since it claims that the Marines in Lebanon are not taking part in combat actions."

No, the U.S. Administration will not escape responsibility for the crimes committed against the Lebanese and for their consequences regarding the Near East situation and international security. People in the Soviet Union resolutely condemn the U.S. actions in Lebanon.

The U.S.-Israeli aggression against the Lebanese people is casting an ominous light on the situation all over the world. Today the destroyer "John Rogers" is shelling Lebanon's peaceful settlements on Washington's orders. Who knows whether similar orders will be given tomorrow to another "Rogers" -- the supreme commander in chief of NATO al[illegible]ed armed forces in Europe -- and the nuclear facilities with which they want to cram West Europe will be set in motion. The facts show that, having started the gamble with the peoples' fates in a "nuclear poker" game, the U.S. Administration is losing to an increasing extent its sense of responsibility and realism.

The campaigns of militarist passion and hysteria are countered by the vigilance, restraint, and prudence of the forces of peace and progress. The peoples of the socialist countries will not be intimidated. Mankind can be confident that the cause of peace is in reliable hands.

GANDHI ADDRESSES NONALIGNED MEETING AT UN

LD272146 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] New York September 27 TASS -- Indira Gandhi, prime minister of India and chairperson of the movement of non-aligned countries, addressed a plenary meeting of non-aligned countries, held at the United Nations headquarters on 26 September.

"Our goal is general and complete disarmament, a process which must necessarily begin with nuclear disarmament," she pointed out. "The first need is to stop the production of nuclear weapons, to reduce and eventually eliminate them". "At the moment the trend is in the opposite direction of expanding existing arsenals. Disarmament cannot make any progress until this process is reversed," she added.

"Several political issues also demand our urgent attention. Peace in West Asia remains of paramount importance. It must be based on just and durable settlement of the questions at the core of the problem: Israeli aggression and the self-determination of and nationhood for the Palestinian people." Indira Gandhi went on: "The independence of Namibia cannot be thwarted or delayed by linking it with extraneous considerations. The United Nations has special responsibility in this regard."

"We are worried about Lebanon. Israel must withdraw completely from Lebanon. Events in Central America, the acts of provocation and aggression aggravating tensions cannot but cause grave concern to non-aligned countries," Indira Gandhi also stated.

REAGAN 'INVITES HIMSELF' AS NONALIGNED LEADER

LD272037 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS -- TASS commentator Boris Zaytsev writes:

Nothing is worse than a guest who crashes the gate. Like such a guest, President Reagan invites himself as a leader of the Non-Aligned Movement, contrary to the interests of sovereign peoples, and having a rather vague notion of the character of the movement. This is shown by another statement of the President that he made recently in a radio address. According to him, the non-aligned countries cannot wait for the United States to assume the leadership of them. The newspaper TIMES OF INDIA points out that in making such statements the President of the United States apparently does not realize what the Non-Aligned Movement means and what aims it pursues.

Indeed, what the countries declaring for disarmament, for the establishment of durable peace and equitable economic order can have in common with Reagan and his retinue pushing the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe and speaking with the rest of the world in the language of economic diktat?

But the President talks unabashed about a certain "right" to dictate his will to peoples of emerging states, members of the Non-Aligned Movement whose very idea the fore-runner of the present masterminds of the U.S. foreign policy course, notorious reactionary John Foster Dulles describes as "amoral".

It must be noted that the United States is the only country in the world which decided that over 100 countries, members of the Non-Aligned Movement, are marching out of step with Washington. It is precisely in such a spirit that the U.S. Department of State summed up the declaration that the seventh non-aligned summit conference adopted in Delhi early this year. It described the declaration as being an "unbalanced" and "polemical" document.

Naturally, the latest touching manifestation of "concern" of President Reagan for young states was assessed by them, and the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement India, as before, as a patent manifestation of a great power egoistic policy of the Washington administration.

The non-aligned countries have weighty reasons to avoid "guidance" by the United States. At various times it brought uncountable sufferings and loss of life to peoples of Korea, Vietnam, Palestine, Nicaragua and other countries. The blood of peaceful people is now being split in the Middle East and in Central America with Washington's blessing and authorisation.

INTERNATIONAL TU CONFERENCE OPENS IN MOSCOW

LD271537 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS -- The tasks of trade unions in the struggle for the improvement of working and living conditions, against imperialism's policy of using food as an instrument of political and economic pressure are under discussion at a conference which opened in Moscow today. The conference is being attended by representatives of national organizations of the food and tobacco industry workers from more than a hundred countries as well as of the International Labour Organisation and the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Speaking at the opening of the conference, Kazimeras Matskyavichyus, secretary of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, pointed out that questions of using food in the interests of the working people and the struggle against the increasing onslaught of transnational corporations are of common interest to trade unions which come out against monopolies attempts at shifting the burden of the capitalist crisis onto the shoulders of ordinary workers. It would be criminal to reconcile oneself to the fact that more than ten million children die of undernourishment every year through the fault of the U.S.-headed most reactionary imperialist forces that unleashed an unheard-of arms race.

Andre Nogie (France), president of the Trade Unions International of the Food Industry Workers, said: "Never before has mankind stockpiled such an amount of weapons which possess a colossal destructive potential. Never before has the arms race developed at such a rate, swallowing so much human energy, material and financial means for the manufacture of the tools of death. But on the other hand, never before has the peoples' movement for peace, against the arms race assumed such a scope". The TUI, he emphasized, has taken and will take an active part in the struggle for peace and disarmament.

The international conference of the food, tobacco, hotel and allied workers will continue till September 30.

U.S. ACCUSED OF HAMPERING KAL DEBRIS HUNTERS

PM271250 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Sep 83 First Edition p 3

[Article by Captain A. Petrov: "Who Stands to Gain?"]

[Text] Pentagon spokesman have recently been issuing press statements alleging that the Soviet side is creating obstacles in the Americans' search for debris from the South Korean Boeing 747 in the Sea of Japan. It has been claimed in particular that Soviet ships "are making every attempt to thwart search operations" by means of dangerous maneuvers close to the U.S. ships engaged in the search. Here attempts have been made to accuse the Soviet Navy of virtually deliberately violating the international rules for preventing the collision of ships at sea (MPPSS-72) and the 1972 Soviet-U.S. agreement on preventing incidents on the high sea and in the airspace above it.

However, the reality looks quite different. It was stressed at the 9 September 1983 Moscow press conference that "no obstacles are being erected and no bans introduced with respect to search operations in the region of the aircraft's possible crash." It is important to bear in mind that, in addition to Soviet ships, U.S., Japanese, and several others ships and vessels are carrying out search operations in this region, despite the fact that debris from the aircraft is on the continental shelf of the USSR, to which the sovereign rights of our state extend.

And if we are speaking of dangerous maneuvering, then according to reports by Soviet ship and aircraft commanders, it is the U.S. side that is perpetrating such actions. Thus, in the Sea of Japan, in the region where the aircraft remains are being sought, on 16, 17, 18, and 19 September the U.S. ships "Badger," "Narrangansett," "Sterrett," "Conserver," and others repeatedly created serious obstacles to Soviet ships and vessels, approaching them on several occasions to within dangerously small distances of as little as 50 meters. And this was done at a time when signals had been raised on Soviets ships showing that they had been inhibited in their maneuvering.

Similar actions have been perpetrated by U.S. ships and aircraft in other regions and, moreover, not under the complex conditions that obtain in the search region, where a large number of Soviet, U.S., South Korean, and Japanese ships are working in a small area. Thus, on 19 September in the Mediterranean U.S. Navy Orion aircraft No 42 approached Soviet cruiser No 126 at an altitude of 70-100 meters and a distance of 50-70 meters. It was a very dangerous incident. And how can we fail to remember the actions in the Barents Sea of the U.S. ship "Sumter," which over the period 9 through 13 June repeatedly violated the provisions of the above-mentioned agreement and MPPSS-72, approaching Soviet surface ships and a submarine at great speed to a distance of up to 150 meters and penetrating a formation of Soviet ships. Here the signal "please do not impede my actions" was unjustifiably raised on the "Sumter."

As is well known, in seeking to safeguard safety of navigation for their ships and safety of flight for their military aircraft, in May 1972 in Moscow the USSR and U.S. Governments concluded the agreement on preventing incidents on the high sea and in the airspace above them. Supplementing international norms, it contains reciprocal undertakings by the two states to prevent unauthorized actions by each side's ships and aircraft that could lead to increased tension between the USSR and the United States.

So far all problems connected with the agreement's fulfillment have been resolved by representatives of the sides on a businesslike basis. You get the impression that someone would like to fuel a hullabaloo around the search operations in the Sea of Japan and in addition to cast a shadow on the Soviet Navy by accusing it of being reluctant to observe the agreement on preventing incidents at sea. However, these fabrications are inconsistent with reality. It is appropriate to ask here: Who stands to gain?

U.S. REACTION TO KAL INCIDENT REPORTED

PM271305 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Palladin dispatch under the rubric "America As It Is": "Intoxication With Anti-Sovietism"]

[Excerpt] Washington -- Even in the account of the local press, the development of events around the South Korean aircraft incident irrefutably proves that the tone in its anti-Soviet interpretation has been set by the U.S. Administration. There is no need to repeat the expressions used, whose meanings and forms have made even some local journalists shudder. ("Until now," one American newspaper writes, "it has been customary to use such language only vis-a-vis states against whom war has been declared.") I would note only that whereas such utterances have become customary for the White House chief, on the lips of Shultz, chief of the U.S. foreign policy department, they have surprised even those who are close to him. Moreover, some of his comments cannot be found either in diplomatic terminology or even in an ordinary dictionary. Experienced American observers such as Joseph Kraft were also staggered by the fact that Shultz, considered to be the only "dove" among the "hawks" who have built themselves a nest in the White House, was the first administration official to start manipulating public opinion in an overtly anti-Soviet spirit, without even (I am citing Kraft) "investigating the crux of the matter or consulting Reagan beforehand."

And yet, according to the weekly U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, it is not Shultz but the President's National Security Adviser Clark who is playing the chief role in kindling passions. As always, the weekly adds, Clark has measured this question against Reagan's personal interests. The White House's subsequent steps are well known, and it remains to note that the further aggravation of Soviet-American relations and the international atmosphere is considered personally advantageous to the U.S. President.

It is not for nothing that in his message to London, Reagan begs the head of the British Government to help knock together a "united front" against the USSR, accompanying his requests with the phrase "this is extremely important to me" -- the same phrase that Thatcher herself used last spring to exhort Washington to support her adventure off the shores of Argentina. And not without reason, the White House voices the hope that the provocation organized on the USSR's Far Eastern borders will help -- even temporarily -- neutralize the antiwar movement, push the plans for aggression in the Near East and Central America through Congress, and whip up the arms race. A cartoon in THE LOS ANGELES TIMES is significant -- it shows an MX missile inscribed "Reagan's monument to the Boeing 747."

Barry Goldwater, who at one time tried to gain the presidency on a similar political platform, voiced complete approval to the present White House chief. "If our country had always manifested such firmness, there would be no Red China, and Vietnam would have been transformed into a huge swamp." Representatives of the military-industrial complex are also rubbing their hands. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, the shares of the Pentagon's main contractors are noticeably increasing in value on Wall Street.

But what about the Washington administration's show of readiness to continue the talks on nuclear armaments in Europe? NEW YORK TIMES observer Gwertzman revealed the true reason behing the White House's maneuvers. It is very important for Reagan, he stressed, citing officials in the presidential entourage, to look moderate and restrained in order to make the installation of U.S. missiles in West Europe easier for himself and the NATO allies.

Such stratagems, however, are beyond the understanding of the ultraconservative wing of the U.S. Republican Party. One of the leaders and ideologists of the "New Right," Richard Viguerie, said on a recent television discussion program: "Reagan should apologize to Carter for accusing his rival in the 1980 presidential campaign of insufficient toughness toward the USSR. At least Carter backed up his words with deeds...."

A kindred spirit of Viguerie -- the observer Safire -- is also disappointed in Reagan: "He has distorted Theodore Roosevelt's behest -- he speaks loudly, but he cannot make up his mind to use the big stick."

The hysterical heat of the latest U.S. anti-Soviet campaign has reached the danger point. "The Pentagon has only one means of dragging the American people into a new military adventure -- by increasing chauvinism and anticommunism to the limit," Brian Baker, head of the Washington organization "People's Mobilization Aganist War," says in this connection, analyzing the aims of the Boeing 747's provocative flight over Soviet territory.

And he is not alone in sharing such misgivings: by no means is the whole of America on the side of those who are raging outside official USSR establishments in the United States, egging on the president and his compatriots with slogans such as "Reagan, don't be a coward!" Responsibility for the fate of the South Korean aircraft, Bernard Winter says in a letter published in THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, lies with those who are kindling the cold war. "The arms race only increases the risk of world catastrophe" is still the conviction of C. Morrison, activist in the Washington organization "For a Nuclear Arms Freeze." THE WASHINGTON POST notes an appreciable growth in concern among ordinary Americans over their future and an increase in suspicions as regards the real reasons for and goals of the White House's fanning of the anti-Soviet campaign. Such sentiments were generalized by Brian Baker: "This ballyhoo does not feed the hungry, nor restore work to the unemployed, nor provide a roof over the heads of the homeless...."

But the White House does not heed the voice of reason. Other voices are ringing out over Washington today. The bout of anti-Soviet hysteria on the banks of the Potomac is continuing and is gathering force. One after the other reports are received: "The U.S. Congress has adopted a resolution couched in unbridled anti-Soviet tones"; "On Capitol Hill an all-time record military budget of $280 billion for Fiscal 1984 alone has been ratified!" ... Intoxication with anti-Sovietism continues, and Washington is not even thinking about the hangover.

REAGAN PEACE TALK, 'MILITIST OBSESSION' VIEWED

PM271832 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Words and Actions"]

[Text] In the final analysis, actions always speak louder than words, even if the words are amplified by very powerful radio transmitters and disseminated in many languages. No rhetoric is capable of compensating for an absence of something material and visible, which gives weight and effectiveness to what is said and uttered, including from the highest rostrums.

It is reported that the White House recently ordered the commissioning of additional capacities for VOA. The purpose is to ensure the widest possible publicity for speeches primarily by the master of the White House himself. Even Americans accustomed to exercises of this sort are surprised: How to explain the burst of activity in this field? No sooner had the U.S. President made a speech on American radio "addressed to all people" than he appeared on the UN rostrum with another speech. Or have the directors of American policy amassed so much of importance that has not been said and that they are in such a hurry to share with the public?

What issues from this orator's lips is not brand-new. He remains true to himself in the most unattractive sense of this concept. Having so persistently eulogized back at the time of the 1980 election campaign militarist, chauvinist aims accompanied by incantations against our country and other socialist countries, once in the presidency Reagan did not moderate the tone of these exercises and made the policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union the cornerstone of U.S. policy.

Over the past 2-3 weeks he has surpassed himself on this "path." He has, so to speak, totally given his favorite filly free rein. And it has so carried on in front of the whole world that the sight of it has caused to recoil even many of those who are generally sympathetic to official Washington's anticommunist policy but who realize that in the nuclear age there are bounds and limits which should by no means be crossed.

The author of these speeches failed to gain the desired capital. Quite the reverse. This is why he decided to change his tone somewhat and to endeavor in his 25 September radio speech to make an impression on the public with assurances that the U.S. Administration is supposedly not at all hostile to our country and wants dialogue and normal relations with us. But is it possible simultaneously to shake one's fists and to extend the hand of readiness for normal relations?

What is preventing official Washington from taking a path which accords with the aspirations of millions of people and the interests of world peace? In the United States now, for example, even representatives of the ruling class such as former Defense Secretary R. McNamara are urging the administration with growing insistence to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons -- following the example set by the Soviet Union. The overwhelming majority of UN states hailed that USSR decision, announced in June of last year during the Second Special UN General Assembly Session on Disarmament. But how did the head of the American Administration react? When he appeared on the UN rostrum at that time, Reagan simply ignored the USSR's historic initiative, as though it were something of little significance.

And to this day Washington refuses even to discuss the possibility of the United States' assuming such an undertaking, in keeping with the thoughts of all peoples without exception and of peace-loving governments.

A treaty on an all-embracing halt to nuclear tests, the prohibition of the use of force in space or from space against the earth, the reduction of states' military expenditures, the creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe and on other continents -- in these and other fields immediate headway could be made, and that would accord with the desires and demands of the overwhelming majority of UN states. What stands in the way of such accords? The obstructionist, militarist policy of the Reagan administration, which bears the responsibility for the dangerous aggravation of the international situation.

Washington has gambled and continues to gamble on exploiting the tension fueled by the ruling circles of the United States and some of its NATO allies to bring economic and political pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. Reagan was jabbering about these short-sighted calculations back in the summer of 1980, when he was conducting his presidential election campaign. His aims and views have not changed in the slightest since then. But something -- and something substantial -- has nonetheless changed.

The initiators of this fueling of the atmosphere cannot fail to see that their line is encountering serious opposition from broad public strata within the United States. Outside the country this opposition was already a fact. But in the United States in late 1979 -- under the impact of the story of the U.S. hostages in Tehran -- official propaganda succeeded in putting many people in a chauvinist mood. This helped Reagan and his entourage to conduct their election campaign in a strident militarist tone, blaming the failures and setbacks of U.S. foreign policy on our country. It was planned that in the future the orchestrators of this campaign would also succeed in keeping the public in a similar frame of mind.

The tempestuous antiwar, antinuclear movement launched in the United States in 1982 shows the unfoundedness of these calculations. No cranking of the wheel of anti-Soviet propaganda can produce the results the ruling U.S. politicians want. This is even truer of the West European public, especially in the FRG.

Recent events have merely strengthened all those who can judge objectively the roots of the tension that has emerged in their opinion as to the gravity of the threat looming over the world as a result of the present U.S. Administration's militarist obsession.

U.S. 'MULLING OVER' INCREASING TROOPS IN LEBANON

LD280839 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 28 Sep 83

[Text] Washington September 28 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports: The U.S. Administration is mulling over plans to widen U.S. military interference in Lebanon even further. This is indicated by President Reagan's statement in a letter to congressional leaders on the adoption by the House Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committees of a War Powers Resolution, under which U.S. Marines will stay put in Lebanon for another 18 months.

Expressing his "gratitude" for the passing of the resolution, Reagan at the same time did not rule out "contingencies" which would require a substantial increase in the numerical strength and role of U.S. Armed Forces in Lebanon. The White House chief also said it was possible that U.S. troops would remain there also after the current 18-month term expired.

When sending a U.S. Marine contingent to Lebanon for the first time, Reagan vowed that their "mission" would be "limited" in time and confined to "peace-keeping" efforts. U.S. troops recently, however, took an immediate part in combat in Lebanon.

REAGAN SIGNS MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

LD272313 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1850 GMT 26 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] President Reagan has signed a draft bill previously passed by Congress allocating $187.5 billion for military expenditures in the next fiscal year. Thus the U.S. Administration has obtained from Congress allocations for all the most important armaments that Reagan aimed for, UPI reports. This concerns primarily those weapons systems with the aid of which the U.S. is calculating to break the existing approximate balance of forces and to achieve military superiority over the USSR and its allies, the billions of dollars set aside for the production of the MX intercontinental ballistic missile, the creation of the latest B-1 strategic bombers and the manufacture of Pershing II medium-range nuclear missiles -- which the United States is planning to deploy on the territory of West Germany -- chemical weapons, and other mass-destruction weapons.

WEINBERGER SEEN PAVING WAY FOR REAGAN IN ASIA

LD271848 Moscow World Service in English 1431 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] The American defense secretary, Caspar Weinberger, is presently making a tour of Asia. His way goes through Japan, China and Pakistan. Vasiliy Fedorov supplies the details:

If we take the program of Caspar Weinberger's voyage published by the Pentagon in advance, we won't find anything unusual in it. It is a routine trip of the head of the military department involving talks with counterparts on purely military issues, including American arms sales and visits to army units and arms manufacturing plants.

This is the impression White House officials are trying to make. Nevertheless, the very first reports from Tokyo gave reason to think that the Defense Secretary focuses on political questions of strategic importance lying within the competence of the American secretary of state, or even the President himself, rather than the defense secretary. For example, he strongly presured the Japanese Government to further strengthen the American-Japanese alliance, and to further involve Tokyo in carrying out Washington's plans for Asia.

THE WASHINGTON POST feels that the purpose of Weinberger's visit to Beijing is to establish new relations with China. It is notable that in the Chinese capital he met with Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian, as well as his counterpart Zhang Aiping. The press proves that, in Beijing, Caspar Weinberger hopes to reduce the consequences of the Sino-American conflict caused by U.S. arms sales to Taiwan. In Islamabad, the chief of the Pentagon is to discuss measures to save the Ziaul Haq regime, the existence of which is compared with living on the edge of a volcano, even in the Western press. Talks will also specify Pakistan's role in the U.S. strategy in Asia.

There are apparently serious reasons for Caspar Weinberger to give priority to general political issues. A number of Asian publications consider the current voyage of the head of the Pentagon one of the main stages of preparations for President Reagan's upcoming tour of several countries in East and Southeast Asia. The President will soon visit Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and Indonesia.

All these countries, except Indonesia, have close military ties with Washington. They play host to (?major) American army contingents and military bases. So President Reagan himself will discuss military issues, which seem to be his special favorites.

After the tour the President intends to make a policy-making speech in Honolulu, which according to the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI will contain the main planks of the new U.S. policy in Asia. The chief objective of the new doctrine, the paper says, is to restore the role of the United States as a world power in Asia and the Pacific. Observers are questioning the novelty of this doctrine, even before it has been declared, because it is based on the growing aggressiveness of the American policy and the military and political enslavement of Asian nations. This is the very policy Washington has been pursuing in Asia since World War II. Its greatest landmarks are aggressive wars in Korea and Vietnam, and numerous conflicts provoked by the United States.

Knowing that its policy is unpopular, Washington is regularly trying to disguise it by new doctrines, such as the Guam Doctrine of President Nixon, the New Pacific Doctrine of President Ford, and the latest of them, the New Policy in Asia. No doubt the current voyage of the U.S. defense secretary is connected with the new doctrine of the White House for Asia. President Reagan has sent his officials to settle unsolved problems where possible, and reduce either by pressure or promises dissatisfaction with the American policy and thus prepare favorable grounds for Reagan's upcoming visits to countries of Asia and the Pacific, visits widely advertised in Washington.

VOA DEPUTY CHIEF ACCUSED OF SPYING IN MOSCOW

PM271632 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Viktor Ponomarev under the rubric "The Secret is Out": "The Same Levitsky..."]

[Text] A U.S. Senate committee was listening to USIA Director Charles Wick. The USIA chief was reporting to the senators on the draft "Program of Democracy and Public Diplomacy."

Modestly noting that this government propaganda program would be an "accompaniment" to the strategic military and economic initiatives of President Reagan, who had announced a "crusade" against communism, Wick demanded $85 million for this "music." A substantial proportion of the money was destined for the government radio station VOA.

As they looked at the numerous diagrams and tables displayed by the USIA chief to make his case more persuasive, the senators maintained a sullen silence. The table headed "Guidelines in the sphere of making national security decisions" had a particularly dispiriting effect. The days of credulous knights errant are long past, and you won't catch an old bird of a senator picking up chaff these days. Therefore, anxious for the reputation of a government organ headed, at the whim of the President, by a specialist in publicity and show business, their questions were very searching: Who will be directing the music for this expensive accompaniment?

Seeing that Mr Wick was being evasive, Paul Tsongas, the perspicacious Democratic senator from Massachusetts, first called the draft "right-wing democracy" and then made the USIA chief go through a minefield of which -- with good cause -- he was frightened. He asked the question directly: Is the CIA still involved in this?

Remaining true to his profession, Wick immediately gave the categorical assurance that the men from the CIA would have nothing at all to do with it! But, having reflected somewhat and having apparently decided that he was among friends and that the senators were his pals, Wick said, although no one was forcing him to speak, that when the draft for USIA and VOA was conceived CIA director William Casey was present at the meetings....

Then the committee chairman, Senator Charles Percy from Illinois, who is usually the most restrained and patient of men, implored: "But for God's sake tell us who will ultimately be responsible for the implementation of the program."

"Quite honestly," Wick replied with due humility, "There is pretty strong disagreement and discord in the leadership."

Certain that the USIA chief was trying to fool them, the senators called the draft a "propaganda stunt" in which VOA, according to two clauses in its charter, has no right to engage, and Senator Percy told Mr Wick to toss "all the tables and diagrams" into the trash can....

There is a reason for our recalling this story, which was recounted with humor and brutal frankness by Mary McGrory, a correspondent of THE WASHINGTON POST. The news recently came from Washington that Melvin Levitsky had been appointed deputy director of VOA. The editorial office archives dispelled all doubts: Yes, it is the same Levitsky!

...Melvin Levitsky, employee of the American Embassy in Moscow, was a frequent visitor to the home of former Muscovite Vitaliy Rubin, who was preparing to leave the USSR. A bald man, thick-waisted, dressed in a nondescript jacket and pants that had not seen an iron for a long time, the diplomat nevertheless gave the impression of being a pleasant, self-assured person. One evening the owner of the house introduced Mr Levitsky to his friend, Soviet citizen S.L.

Having withdrawn at first into another room with Rubin, the American then talked ecstatically and at length about civil liberties and S.L.'s plans to leave for the "free world," and hinted that not everyone was able to make a living on the other side of the Atlantic. It all depends, he said, on what you bring with you....

Events developed rapidly from then on: Levitsky knew everything about S.L. and decided that the "fruit" was ripe. Once, when S.L. was in his apartment, he received a telephone call from his old friend David Azbel, who had gone to the United States and settled in St. Paul, Minnesota. David said that S.L. would soon be receiving "live greetings" from him, and he repeated verbatim what the American had said. The "live greetings" turned out to be Levitsky. At the second meeting in Rubin's home he did not beat around the bush. He sent Rubin's wife into the kitchen and, left alone with S.L., the diplomat, using a self-erasing notepad and occasionally sinking into a whisper, informed him that "David has talked about his Moscow friend to the right people in the States" and they wanted him to do them a service. The nature of the service was contained in a special envelope which emerged from the American's pocket.

"Dear friend," was how the message began. "David has told us all about you and we have no greater concern than your safety. When you have read this letter it must be destroyed immediately in the presence of the man who gave it to you. The letter has been written on special paper and must be immersed in water, where it will dissolve. You will be given a fountain pen. Unscrew it and carefully remove the blue nib where you will find a letter wrapped around a matchstick. Bear in mind that your safety depends on the strict fulfillment of what is written there."

Scarcely had S.L. read the message than Levitskiy thrust a piece of paper into his hand and asked him to fill out a CIA "personnel record" form. The diplomat became nervous, repeatedly reached for his handkerchief and mopped his perspiring bald head. When the lock on the door clicked open he hastily crumpled the letter and plunged it into his cup of coffee -- all that remained of the paper were white flakes, and the coffee had taken on a milky hue. (One can only guess what Levitskiy was thinking then and how he felt after swallowing that drink -- in accordance with the requirements of the conspiracy.) When it became clear that it was the owner of the house and that the alarm was for nothing, Levitskiy breathed a sigh of relief, regretted the "letter that he had consumed" and, on completing his mission to recruit a Soviet citizen, took the form from S.L. and handed him the pen, slapped him on the back and said: "Read the instructions at home. Good night."

At home in his apartment, S.L. opened the pen and removed a thin piece of film. This was the CIA's instructions on methods of secret contact.

"Esteemed friend," the instruction ran, "we have chosen a very safe way for you to hand over your materials to us. We have checked it out carefully and it works successfully. First you must find the secret hiding place which we have called 'Ploshchadka.' To find it...." There then followed a long description of the route to the hiding place, with bus changes and detours through the backstreets of Moscow. The instructions, consisting of 13 frames of film, contained advice on how to set up the hiding place, how to remove the materials from the containers, and how to place red lipstick marks on columns to show that he was ready to receive a communication or to send a report to the CIA.

S.L. began to worry: The matter had taken an unexpected and quite unpleasant turn for him. And here, no doubt anticipating his "protege's" possible hesitation, Levitsky again set his henchmen on him. He ordered that S.L.'s doubts be dispelled and that if necessary he even be threatened with exposure by saying that the form was already with the CIA. Just the day after Levitsky's meeting with S.L., Rubin reassured him, saying: "I see nothing strange in this; Melvin is a CIA staffer and it is perfectly natural (!) that he has his own specific interests." And Azbel phoned from the United States to say: "You have to earn your future life in the States!"

The spider's web built in Moscow by Levitsky, the CIA "defender of rights," was smashed. S.L. did not regain his clarity of sight at once, nor was it easy. He had occasion to feel personally and in full the treachery and hypocrisy of U.S. secret diplomacy. Having broken the web, he sent an open letter to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, subsequently published in IZVESTIYA, in which, by means of documents and other substantive evidence, he exposed the espionage activity of the "diplomat" Levitsky, of (Presel), his successor in the post of spy, and the renegades who lured him onto the slippery path of betraying the motherland.

When Melvin Levitsky, the professional from Langley, was involved in espionage matters of this kind in Moscow, he had nothing in common with "public diplomacy." Now that Mr Reagan has declared a "crusade" against communism, the Levitskys and other "fighters for democracy" have again crawled out of their holes.

Melvin Levitsky is now "on the air:" He has found his own "voice." And while the senators are debating in their committee how to restore world public trust in VOA broadcasts and how to ensure that they are perceived as objective, honest, and propaganda-free, the words and music for the U.S. Administration's radio station continue to be ordered by the espionage department via Melvin Levitsky and his other radio henchmen.

MOSCOW TV NOTES TALKS BETWEEN WEINBERGER, ZHANG

LD272319 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1850 GMT 26 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov']

[Text] Pentagon chief Weinberger, who is on a visit to Beijing, and Chinese National Defense Minister Zhang Aiping held talks today. The XINHUA agency carried a brief report to the effect that the sides exchanged opinions on questions of mutual interest. [shots of Weinberger and Zhang inspecting troops]

Meanwhile, according to a report by the American television company NBC, Weinberger said today that in the U.S. Administration's opinion the modernization of the Chinese Armed Forces and the strengthening of China's economy meet American interests. The atmosphere of the visit shows that Sino-American military relations may develop into something more than simply obtaining American technology, NBC notes. [shots of Weinberger speaking]

The American press is keeping a close watch on this visit, noting that Weinberger's talks in Beijing will be held just 1 and 1/2 months before the trip to Asia by President Reagan himself. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, the organ of U.S. financial circles, stresses that the While House is trying to achieve some kind of foreign policy effect, since to date Reagan has had nothing but crises, the paper stresses.

PAKISTAN UNREST BLAMED ON U.S. 'VITAL INTERESTS'

PM27/1527 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Sep 83 First Edition p 3

[V. Korolev commentary: "Pakistan in U.S. Aggressive Strategy"]

[Text] For several weeks now mass riots of the population have continued in Pakistan in protest against the present regime of General Ziaul Haq. "Close to a revolt" is how the French newspaper LE MATIN described the situation in Sind Province. A similar situation is observed in all the country's other provinces.

The riots in Pakistan are a logical consequence of the regime's antipopular policy. Martial law has been in force in the country since 1977, the parliament has been dissolved, and the constitution has been suspended. All political parties have been banned. The course toward militarization Pakistan has embarked on entails constantly rising military spending, which has a pernicious effect on the population's living standard. Internal troubles are aggravated by the foreign policy conducted by Islamabad, which , in its subservience to Washington, is turning the country into a bridgehead of U.S. aggression in southwest Asia.

The demonstrators demand the abolition of the military regime, the restoration of democratic freedoms, and the dissolution of the military alliance with Washington. To suppress the increasingly anti-American popular riots, police and troops are being used. Dozens of people have been killed, hundreds injured, and thousands thrown into prison.

Washington, its patron, is hastening to the tottering regime's assistance. "At this very moment, at the height of the demonstrations, the White House has announced new arms deliveries to the Pakistani regime," the Delhi newspaper STATESMAN points out in this connection.

The transatlantic strategists' interest in Pakistan increased after the overthrow of the monarchy in Iran, which had acted as the United States' regional gendarme. THE NEW YORK TIMES remarked recently that Pakistan plays "a key role in safeguarding U.S. strategic intersts" in the vast region where it is situated. Of the $3.2 billion in U.S. "aid" to Islamabad, the greater part is spent on deliveries of the latest types of weapons. These include 40 F-16 fighter-bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons. The United States has long been encouraging Pakistan's nuclear ambitions. According to the Indian press, enterprises for the enrichment of uranium and for processing nulcear fuel are under construction in Pakistan. The newspaper PATRIOT wrote that Pakistan has already carried out an underground test of a nuclear device at the proving ground southeast of Quetta.

Serious concern among Indian parliamentairans has been aroused by the U.S. decision to supply Pakistan with Harpoon ship-to-ship missiles and Vulcan-Phalanx anti-aircraft batteries. The massive arms deliveries to Pakistan, including F-16 fighter-bombers, represent a real threat to our country's security, V. Patil, member of the Indian parliament stated.

Drawn more and more deeply into U.S. imperialism's aggressive strategy in west and southwest Asia, the Ziaul Haq regime has consented to the use by the Americans of bases on Pakistani territory and to the setting up of electronic surveiliance stations there. According to the foreign press, these military facilities will operate in particular in Karachi, Gwadar, Peshawar, and Sargodha. Their purpose is to back up the actions of the Rapid Deployment Force, set up by Washington for intervention in the affairs of states in the Near East and the Persian Gulf region.

U.S. plans to set up a new military bloc to replace the crumbling CENTO are to a considerable degree linked with Pakistan. Let's recall that this military alliance originally comprised Britain, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan and Turkey and was known as the Baghdad Pact at that time. The Americans used it to secure their economic and military positions in the Near East and the western part of the Indian Ocean. However, after the withdrawal from CENTO of first Iraq, and then Iran, the bloc ceased to exist. And so now Washington strategists are looking for a replacement for it so that a new alliance can fill the vacuum and watch over U.S. "vital interests" in that part of the world. And Pakistanis are being assigned a central place in the new alliance.

Carrying out the transatlantic patrons' instructions, Islamabad has engaged in energetic efforts to knock together a new military bloc. Recently a number of Pakistani military delegations have visited various countries in southwest Asia in an attempt to help the Americans to draw these countries into the orbit of the Pentagon's strategy.

But Pakistan's role in Washington's strategic designs is not limited to this. U.S. plans envisage in particular the siting of subunits of Pakistani troops in "friendly" countries of the region to serve as the mian support for pro-American reactionary regimes. Even now more than 30,000 Pakistani servicemen are stationed on the territories of other countries, including Saudi Arabia and Oman. A special division comprising 20,000 officers and men has been formed in Pakistan for deployment in "crisis" areas.

Washington is also using Pakistan extensively as a bridgehead for subversive operations against Afghanistan, India, and a number of other countries in the region. Now that the whole world has learned about the monstrous provocation involving the South Korean plane that intruded into the USSR's airspace, the memory of a similar case that happened just over two decades ago involuntarily comes to mind. Then, on 1 May 1960, a U.S. U-2 spy plane flown by the pilot Powers took off from an airfield in Peshawar on Pakistani territory. The spy pilot later admitted that he had been dispatched on a reconnaissance mission. But at first Washington, as in the present case with the South Korean plane, denied the true aims of the U-2 flight and, as in the present case, claimed that the plane allegedly "went off course." It is also well known how adversely the U-2 flight affected the international situation. Considerable blame for this lay with the Pakistani authorities, which, then as now, let the territory of their country be used for provocations by the U.S. military and by U.S. special services.

But the lessons of the past are obviously of no benefit. Now, in the area of the selfsame Peshawar, with the knowledge and connivance of the authorities, dozens of camps for "Afghan refugees" have been set up with U.S. money. Afghan counter-revolutionaries undergo training in these camps. Pakistan is the main base of the U.S. undeclared war against the Afghan people.

Recently it was announced in the Pakistani capital that U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger is to visit there shortly. According to a report by the AP news agency, the main topic of his talks will be the further expansion of military cooperation between the two countries.

Washington is pushing Pakistan ever further down a dangerous path, and this is evoking the legitimate indignation of the country's population. Its vital interests demand a different policy -- a policy of peace and friendship with neighboring countries, of refusal to take part in U.S. military adventures, and of strengthened national independence. Only such a policy can ensure the genuine security of Pakistan and the welfare of its people.

GROMYKO, PRK'S HUN SEN BANQUET SPEECHES CITED

BK250359 Phnom Penh SPK in English 1122 GMT 24 Sep 83

[Text] Phnom Penh, SPK, September 24 -- A banquet was given in Moscow recently in honour of Hun Sen, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, and vice chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The host, A.A. Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and first vice chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister for foreign affairs of the Soviet Union, said in his toast:

"Our meeting and talks will help strengthen mutual understanding in matters related to relations between our two countries and in international problems of common concern."

"The Soviet Union and the PRK," A. Gromyko continued, "are bound to each other by close bonds of friendship and cooperation. I take this occasion to lay special emphasis on the meeting in Moscow in December 1982 between Comrade Yu. Andropov and Comrade Heng Samrin. It was during that meeting that the two sides reaffirmed their common determination to continue promoting the relations between the two parties and the two states."

"The Soviet people," Foreign Minister Gromyko said, "rejoice at the achievements of the Kampuchean people in national revival and in the discharge of the tasks of building a new society set by the fourth P.R.P.K. congress. The Soviet Union and the other countries in the socialist community are providing a fraternal assistance and support to the P.R.K. in this cause."

The Kampuchean people have opted for a social [as received] regime of their own," Gromyko pointed out. "They have decided whom to make friends with and whom to rely on. No outsiders may interfere with Kampuchea's internal affairs. Nobody can reverse the political, economic and social development of this country."

The Soviet foreign minister went on to say: "At their present meeting the two sides once again affirm the identity of view between the two parties and countries in their assessment of the current world situation and in the way of settling pressing international problems.

"The line pursued by the PRK, together with Vietnam and Laos, to turn Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and to start a dialogue between the Indochinese and ASEAN countries is serving efforts towards a healthy political atmosphere in that region."

"I wish to say again that I am satisfied with the results of our exchange of view and at our unanimity," Gromyko said in conclusion.

In reply Foreign Minister Hun Sen said: "This meeting gives added proof to the fact that we see eye to eye on questions concerning our relations and on the most important problems of the world."

"In defiance of all schemes by the imperialists and other reactionary forces," Hun Sen said, "the revolution in Kampuchea is strengthened incessantly and is advancing relentlessly. We can note with joy that all that we have gained in the rebirth of our country is inseparable from the valuable and effective assistance given by the Soviet Union in all fields and right at the first moments of our liberation."

"The PRK fully supports the peace policy advocated by the CPSU because it meets the earnest aspirations of the Kampuchean people and all other nations," the Kampuchean foreign minister declared.

CSSR'S CHNOUPEK MEETS WITH GROMYKO IN MOSCOW

Joint Communique Issued

PM271657 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 83 First Edition p 4

["Soviet-Czechoslovak Joint Communique"]

[Text] Bohuslav Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and foreign minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, paid a working visit to the Soviet Union 26-27 September.

Talks were held between A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, and B. Chnoupek during which questions of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations and also a number of urgent international problems were discussed.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the fruitful development of relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia on the firm basis of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Aid of 6 May 1970. The special importance of the meetings and conversations between Yu.V. Andropov and G. Husak was emphasized in this connection.

The desire of the USSR and the CSSR to continue to expand and deepen their bilateral relations in all spheres, to strengthen the fraternal friendship between the Soviet and Czechoslovak peoples, and to promote in every possible way the further consolidation of the cooperation among the socialist community countries within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA was reaffirmed.

Unity of views both in assessing the present international situation and regarding the reasons for its sharp deterioration and the growth of the military threat was again revealed during the exchange of opinions.

The complex character of the present development of events in Europe and in the world arena as a whole is a direct result of the actions of aggressive imperialist circles, above all in the United States, which are trying to secure military superiority in order to foist their will on others and to dominate the world. They are implementing unprecedented military programs, kindling seats of tension and conflicts, and stepping up crude interference in the internal affairs of many countries and peoples. They are systematically undermining normal relations between states with different social systems, resorting in the process to fueling militarist psychosis, to ideological subversion, to shameless falsifications and slander regarding the socialist countries -- falsifications and slander designed to fool the peoples -- and to organizing large-scale provocative actions that flout elementary norms of international law.

An exceptional danger is posed by the plans for deploying in West Europe new American nuclear missiles designed to disrupt to the advantage of the United States and NATO the balance in medium-range nuclear facilities that exists in the European zone. The implementation of this plan would inevitably lead to consequences of a military and political nature that would substantially complicate the situation in Europe and beyond. If matters reach the point of the actual deployment of the aforementioned missiles, then the USSR, the CSSR, and the other Warsaw Pact states will be faced with the need to take countermeasures in order to safeguard their security and preserve military parity on both the European and global scales. Their statements on this score are well known and remain in force.

The sides expressed the hope that the United States and its allies will seriously and realistically ponder the prevailing situation and that the U.S. Administration will really display a desire to reach agreement and will respond to the Soviet Union's constructive proposals on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe, proposals that are based on the principle of equality and equal security.

The Czechoslovak side expressed full support for these proposals, and also for the USSR's position at the Soviet-American talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms.

In the sides' opinion, a quantitative and qualitative freeze on nuclear arms by all states that possess them would be one of the most effective and timely measures moving toward a solution of the most vital common human task -- that of preventing nuclear war. An especially important role could also be played by the adoption, following the Soviet Union's example, by all the other nuclear powers -- which have not yet done this -- of a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The USSR and the CSSR proceed from the premise that steps to curb the nuclear arms race must be bolstered by the resolute and unreserved condemnation by all states of nuclear war as the most monstrous of crimes against mankind.

Both sides regard preventing the militarization of space as a question of exceptional urgency and importance. It is precisely this that is the main point of the Soviet initiative "On Concluding a Treaty on the Prohibition of the Use of Force in Outer Space and From Space With Respect to the Earth," which has been placed on the agenda of the current UN General Assembly session.

The Warsaw Pact countries' proposal on concluding between them and the NATO states a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace is coming to the forefront of European and international politics. The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia believe that this proposal should be translated into the plane of practical discussion.

After positively assessing the results of the Madrid meeting, results which demonstrated the continuing vitality of the policy of detente, the sides noted that a contribution by all the states that took part in the all-European conference will be required for success at the forthcoming conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

A.A. Gromyko and B. Chnoupek exchanged opinions about the situation in the Near East, where the anti-Arab [vrazhebnaya Arabam] nature of the American-Israeli strategic alliance, which is directed against a just peace in the region, is emerging more than ever before. Resolute condemnation was leveled at the aggressive actions of the United States, which has embarked on the path of the direct utilization of military force in Lebanon in order to foist on the Lebanese people an enslaving agreement that they reject, an agreement that infringes the sovereignty of their state, and in order to pressure those forces in the Arab world, primarily Syria and the Palestinians, that are refusing to obey the diktat of Washington and Tel Aviv.

Noting the positive significance of the cease-fire agreement reached between the sides in the internal Lebanese conflict, the participants in the talks expressed the conviction that lasting peace in Lebanon can be ensured only provided that there is a complete and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from that country and from the other Arab territories. The interventionist forces of the United States and the NATO countries acting in concert with it must also be withdrawn from Lebanon.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia oppose Washington's interference in the affairs of Central American and Caribbean states and advocate the resolution of problems there by political means, with strict respect for the inalienable rights of the region's peoples.

The two sides' principled position regarding the unceasing aggression by the Republic of South Africa in Angola and other African countries and the imperialist intrigues over the question of the decolonization of Namibia was also reaffirmed.

The participants in the talks unanimously advocated that the attempts to create obstacles to the normal activity of the United Nations be ended and that suitable conditions be ensured for the work of representatives of the organization's member states.

Guided by the decision of the Prague conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee and the June meeting in Moscow of the top party and state figures of the fraternal countries, the USSR and the CSSR, together with the other socialist community states, will continue to coordinate closely their foreign policy actions in the interests of countering the adventurist U.S. course and the NATO bloc's militarist policy and to do everything in their power to maintain security and develop coopertion in Europe, strengthen the foundations of international peace, and remove the threat of nuclear disaster.

Gromyko, Chnoupek Speak

LD271702 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep (TASS) -- The countries of socialism regard it as their main task to bring about a turn of events toward radically improving the political climate in the world and, first and foremost, averting the danger of a new war. This was stated today by Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs. He was speaking at a luncheon given in honor of Bohuslav Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR minister of foreign affairs, who is paying a working visit to Moscow.

The solution of this task, Andrey Gromyko went on, has now become a matter of vital urgency. The aggressive policy of the United States and of those forces in NATO which are being dragged along behind this policy and participate in it is creating a threat to peace.

This arrogant and adventurist course is aimed at achieving military superiority. Washington wants at all costs to impose upon the rest of the world systems which suit it, and to rule the destiny of the world.

The countries of the socialist community counterpose to this course their peace-loving policy toward the strengthening of security and cooperation in Europe and toward the consolidation of the foundations of universal peace. They put forward as of paramount importance solution of the key problem toward the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and the limitation, reduction, and eventual complete liquidation of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union, Andrey Gromyko continued, has inscribed this on the banner of its foreign policy. Proceeding from the interests of counteracting the nuclear threat, it proposes to undertake such an effective measure as the freeze, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of all nuclear armaments.

With the same end in view, the Soviet Union calls on other nuclear powers, which now have not done so, to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Nuclear war itself must always be firmly condemned by all states as a very grave crime against mankind.

As far as Europe is concerned, Andrey Gomyko said, we come out for freeing it totally from nuclear weapons or, if our partners are not ready for this, for a radical reduction of medium-range nuclear means as a first step which is in accord with the interests of European and international security. And the Soviet Union has introduced the corresponding proposals at the Geneva talks with the United States.

Why do the United States and its NATO allies turn away from the principle of equality and equal security, deliberately putting forward one-sided proposals which are unacceptable to the other side? Andrey Gromyko stated. This can only signify their intention to continue to block the talks and avoid an agreement.

The countries of the Warsaw Treaty, he stressed, have had their weighty say about this: If attempts are made to destroy the balance of medium-range nuclear means which has arisen in the European zone, they will be obliged to take countermeasures to protect their security and maintain military parity.

Andrey Gromyko noted that Washington's line of kindling hotbeds of tension in various regions of the world also exacerbates the international situation.

Its Near East policy is hostile to the Arab peoples, he said. Virtually all the veils camouflaging it are now being shed. Openly using military force in Lebanon, they are now acting there like an occupying force, which in its cruelty is indistinguishable from the colonialists of the past who enslaved the peoples with fire and sword.

The cease-fire agreement reached by the sides in the internal Lebanese conflict is of positive significance. However, a stable peace in Lebanon can only be secured on the condition of total and immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from that country and from the other Arab territories. The interventionist forces of the United States and the NATO countries acting with it should also be withdrawn from Lebanon.

Andrey Gromyko also pointed to the crude interference practised by the U.S. Administration in Central America. Here also, he remarked, they resort to using the full range of ways and means of the aggressors. In this the services of corrupt regimes and bloody juntas are used shamelessly.

As a powerful factor with positive influence on the course of world events and by showing readiness for cooperation with all states desiring it, the socialist countries are doing everything within their power to overcome the present difficult stage in international negotiations. And they will not diverge from this path, Andrey Gromyko said.

In his speech in reply, Bohuslav Chnoupek stressed that the talks which have taken place have confirmed the complete unity of views of the sides on all issues of international life. This is exceptionally important, especially today when tension in the world, especially through the fault of the most reactionary forces of imperialism, led by the United States, has reached an extremely dangerous threshold.

Bohuslav Chnoupek stressed that the CSSR regards of primary importance the consolidation of unity among the socialist countries, and deepening coordination of their foreign policy activities.

We consider the planned deployment of new medium-range American missiles in the NATO countries to be extremely dangerous for peace not only in Europe but throughout the world. We fully support all the proposals made by the USSR, which lead to the reaching of a just and mutually acceptable solution based on the principle of equality and equal security. The substantial new constructive initiatives that Yuriy Andropov put forward recently are viewed by us as a fresh expression of good will and great flexibility in the search for ways of achieving an accord.

Meetings Reported

LD271457 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep (TASS) -- Talks continued in Moscow today between Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs, and Bohuslav Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR minister of foreign affairs.

Main attention was paid to the situation in Europe, primarily in connection with the plans of the United States and its allies in the North Atlantic alliance on deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles in some West European countries. Both sides stressed the importance of the decision taken at the Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to strive for the consolidation of peace and the relaxation of tension in Europe.

Andrey Gromyko and Bohuslav Chnoupek said that as a result of the aggressive policy of the United States and its allies, tension is increasing in the Near East, Central America, the Caribbean area, southern Africa and other parts of the world. The ministers also discussed some questions of Czechoslovak-Soviet relations and noted with satisfaction that these relations are developing successfully and dynamically.

Andrey Gromyko gave a breakfast in honor of Bohuslav Chnoupek, at which they exchanged speeches.

Chnoupek Interviewed on TV

LD271937 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Sep 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Excerpts] Before his departure, Comrade Chnoupek was interviewed by a Vremya program correspondent:

[Begin Chnoupek video recording in Russian] Our talks, both yesterday and today, the content and spirit of which will be reflected in the communique, passed in the traditional atmosphere of mutual understanding and were a very beneficial and fine contribution to the common cause of the joint, coordinated policy of socialist countries.

We devoted particular attention to the international situation. I would like to say that on the basic positions, our points of view fully concur. We devoted attention, as a European country, to the situation in Europe, especially from the viewpoint of the threatening danger of the deployment of American medium-range missiles in certain West European countries. We also devoted a great deal of attention to continuing the Helsinki conference [as heard] and implementing, so to speak, the Madrid meeting.

I would like to give very high appraisal to our conversations and exchange of opinion, in that they constitute, as I stated at the beginning, yet another step forward, so to speak, in strengthening, developing and deepening our joint coordinated policy in the field of foreign relations. [end recording]

A joint Soviet-Czechoslovak communique was adopted on the results of the visit, the text of which is published in the central press.

CSSR Journalists Interview Chnoupek

LD271823 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 1620 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Interview with Bohuslav Chnoupek, Czechoslovak minister of foreign affairs, with group of unidentified Czechoslovak journalists in Moscow on 27 September following Chnoupek's talks with USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko -- recorded]

[Text] [Question] Comrade minister, you held talks with Comrade Gromyko about a number of questions. Which of them do you consider the most important and what were your conclusions?

[Chnoupek] I would say that all issues were rather important, and Comrade Gromyko agreed, because in their complexity they represent the core of the activity and striving of socialism for peace, security, the preservation of detente. If I am to choose any of them, I would like to emphasize, above all, that both sides welcomed the opportunity for such an exchange of opinions from the point of view of exacting further the coordinated policy of our fraternal parties, the policy of our governments which was prepared by the congresses of our Communist Parties and which is leaning upon the line prepared by the Central Committees of our parties. In this connection we stressed that the unity of the fraternal socialist parties in the fight for our ideals and aims is the key factor. From this viewpoint, Comrade Gromyko and (?we) highly appreciated the content of this meeting.

As for the other issues, I would like to point out that we agreed completely on the assessment of the current situation in the world, which is unfortunately very complicated and sharpened, and that our viewpoints were identical about the reasons for this state of affairs. We again pointed out that the main reason is the adventurous, unrealistic steps of the aggressive forces of imperialism, especially of the current U.S. Administration. We spoke for a long time about the situation in Europe, about the relations with some states of Western Europe. We spoke for a long time about continuation of Madrid and the preparations for the Stockholm conference next January.

We devoted a lot of time to the issue of the talks on the medium range missiles and the threat to Europe if the deployment of the U.S. missiles in some West European NATO countries does take place. We said that there is still time; that it is still possible to find a solution through talks; to find compromises leading to an agreement. But if, in spite of all this, in spite of the effort of the general public of Western Europe, in spite of the anti-missile peace movement in Western Europe, in spite of the realistic, flexible and far-reaching proposals of the USSR conveyed in Comrade Andropov's latest interviews, if such an agreement does not take place, the socialist countries will have no other choice -- as said in the position of our party presidium and the government, which fully supported the standpoint of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the adoption of additional measures -- except to adopt such additional measures as are necessary to attain a balance in the sphere of nuclear armament.

Naturally, we also paid great attention to other continents -- Africa, Asia, the Far East, America. I would like to speak specifically about one issue: our standpoint on the current situation in Lebanon. We said very clearly -- in the talks and also at the toast at the luncheon today -- that we categorically demand noninterference in the internal affairs of Lebanon, the departure of the Israeli Armed Forces, and also the departure of the armed forces of some NATO countries, to let Lebanon deal with its own problems on its own.

As for the U.S. problems in Central America, we concentrated our attention on the aggressive steps of the U.S. imperialism in this area, especially the violation of Nicaraguan territory. We spoke about the issues of South Africa, and we explicitly said that SWAPO ought to be the master in its own house, as the only representative of Namibia. We also spoke about a number of issues pertaining to Asia. As for international policy issues, we briefly analyzed a whole collection of the most important problems. I am glad to say that this was a very productive, very effective and exceptionally useful meeting.

[Question] Comrade minister, how do you view the development of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations? What in particular would you like to underline?

[Chnoupek] Traditionally, as is customary during such meetings, we paid great attention to the development of our mutual relations. I would like to emphasize that we were pleased to hear from Comrade Gromyko personally his high appreciation of the policy of our Communist Party, and our government, in realization of internationalism in practice, which has imbued the entire area of our mutual relations. The principal policy of our party, which we implement in the realization of the conclusions of our congresses, was very highly praised. Comrade Gromyko, speaking on behalf of the government, highly praised our economic relations. Using very emphatic expressions and fine words, he praised the vast growth of activity in the sphere of economic relations with the Soviet Union, the growth of trends and the big steps we made in the sphere of cooperation and specialization. He said that economic relations with Czechoslovakia were being assessed by the Soviet Government and the highest party bodies of the USSR as exemplary and very, very good. The same can be said about the sphere of culture, education and sport. So, to put it briefly, as you asked me at the beginning of the interview, we can describe our relations -- as was repeatedly emphasized by Comrade Husak from congress platforms and at the sessions of our Central Committees -- as relations without a historic precedent: very good and very active relations.

Chnoupek Departs Moscow

LD271507 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep (TASS) -- Bohuslav Chnoupek, CSSR minister of foreign affairs, who was in the USSR on a working visit, left Moscow for home today.

He was seen off at the airport by Andrey Gromyko, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and other officials.

BRITISH, FRENCH ROLE IN NATO NUCLEAR TALLY SEEN

PM271415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 83 First Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent A. Maslennikov: "Behind the Fence of Dodges"]

[Text] London, Sep -- If you listen to NATO propagandists you may form the impression that practically the only main obstacle on the path to reaching an agreement in Geneva on nuclear arms limitation in Europe is the question of including the British and French nuclear forces in the overall European balance. That, incidentally, is what British Prime Minister M. Thatcher has been saying during her current tour of a number of West European countries.

Refusing to acquiesce to this method of reckoning, NATO representatives allege that the British and French nuclear weapons do not belong to the NATO military structure and can only be put into operation through the will of those countries' "national commands."

The aim of this line is understandable. If you count the British and French missiles at the talks, then Reagan's "zero" and "interim" options are smashed to smithereens and nothing remains of the arguments concerning the USSR's mythical "missile monopoly" so favored in Washington and other NATO capitals.

The falsity and farfetched nature of the NATO arguments are revealed when you compare them, even most cursorily, with the real situation in the NATO bloc, even in the form depicted in official publications. It is sufficient to mention the brochure published recently by the British Defense Ministry, which states outright that "the British nuclear forces, both strategic and tactical.... are placed at the alliance's disposal."

The unsoundness of the allegations of some "special" status for the London and Paris nuclear forces was exposed even more convincingly in the report by the U.S. Congressional Research Service. The report's authors note that whatever provisos may be advanced to substantiate their allegedly independent nature, this does not relieve Britain and France of their commitments in the event of a conflict to act in conjunction with the other NATO countries, as envisaged by the 1949 treaty on the bloc's creation and by other documents.

Official British documents state frankly that "in an emergency" Britain's nuclear submarine fleet is at the disposal of the NATO Supreme Command in Europe and operates against targets in accordance with its plans. As for the right that the British Government has formally reserved to issue orders itself for the use of its nuclear arsenal in the event of a conflict, in that respect, the report's authors write, Britain's situation in no way differs from the situation of the United States, whose nuclear forces can also only be used within the NATO framework with authorization from the U.S. President.

Well, how do matters stand with France? It is claimed that since Paris withdrew from the NATO military organization in 1966 the NATO command decisions will not extend to it. But the above-mentioned report is categorical: "The provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty are as binding for France as they are for other signatory states."

We can also mention that in August 1981 the FRG Government Press Department published a document which frankly stated: "Medium-range nuclear weapons must include the British and French submarine-launched ballistic missiles because they are not covered by the SALT II treaty."

However, it is not merely a case of legal niceties. The question of including the British and French nuclear forces in the toal tally of nuclear potentials in the European region has acquired fundamental significance parimarily because it is a case of the preservation of equilibrium and consequently of the prospects for easing nuclear confrontation on our continent. We cannot fail to see that the NATO strategists attempts to remove the British and French nuclear forces from the overall European balance -- and, moreover, under conditions where these countries are planning a substantial expansion and modernization of their arsenals -- are aimed not only at giving NATO a substantial advantage. They would be tantamount to the USSR's unilateral nuclear disarmament, which the Soviet side, naturally, cannot undertake. By refusing to soberly assess the situation existing in Europe and to meet the Soviet Union's proposals halfway, Washington and its allies are creating an obstacle on the path of an accord in Geneva.

This fact is beginning to penetrate the consciousness of increasingly broad circles of the West European public. In Britain, for instance, critical comments about the nuclear arms race fueled by Washington and NATO combined with calls for a realistic assessment of the Soviet initiatives' peace potential can be encountered increasingly frequently not only in the democratic press but also in British business organs like THE FINANCIAL TIMES, the magazine THE ECONOMIST, and others. Noting that the NATO leadership will sooner or later have to consent to include the British and French nulcear forces in the overall European tally, THE ECONOMIST wrote recently that obstinacy on this issue, together with the updating of its nuclear fleet planned by the British Government, seriously complicate the progress of the Geneva talks and make it difficult to draft an agreement equally acceptable to both sides.

The USSR's recent proposals set out in Yu.V. Andropov's replies to PRAVDA's questions have generated special interest in the Western capitals. Pointing out that these proposals open the way not only to halting the arms race but also to real disarmament, the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN urged the Soviet Union's Western partners to abandon their characteristic negative approach and study more attentively the opportunities included in these proposals for the mutual rapprochement of their positions. Ultimately THE GUARDIAN writes, it must not be forgotten that there is a strong current in the West that believes the British and French nuclear forces should be included on the agenda of the Geneva talks. "If you look at the balance of forces from Moscow's position, the Soviet Union is confronted by three hostile powers with nuclear weapons.... While the members of the Western alliance have only one adversary.... The fact that neither Britain nor France is represented at the talks has no bearing on the essence of the matter," THE GUARDIAN notes.

Counting the British and French nuclear potential at the talks, THE GUARDIAN stresses, would under no circumstances disrupt the existing strategic equilibrium.

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which unites over a quarter of a million people in its ranks, says the NATO countries should give a constructive answer to the new Soviet proposals, including an agreement to count the British and French nuclear forces in the overall European tally, as the Soviet Union is rightly requesting.

All this, of course, in no way means that those opposed to a sober consideration of the realities existing in Europe -- a consideration on which peace and stability on our continent depend -- have disappeared in the West. Unable to oppose the Soviet peace program with any convincing counterarguments, they have recently been shifting increasingly frequently to indiscriminate criticism of the Soviet state's entire foreign and domestic policy. An example is the anti-Soviet hysteria fueled in connectio with the act of provocation organized by Washington over the South Korean aircraft.

At the same time McCarthyist persecution of peace champions has been unleashed. The political point of this persecution is to try to disorient and demoralize the supporters of nuclear disarmament and thus psychologically prepare West Europeans for the deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles in their countries.

To be fair, it should be said, however, that this campaign is beginning to malfunction and is being rebuffed even in the most bourgeois press. Certain circles in the West, particularly in Washington, the influential British weekly THE OBSERVER wrote recently, assert that they see no possibility of conducting serious talks with the Soviet Union on the nuclear weapons issue until it changes its domestic and foreign policy. However, this approach overlooks the very crux of East-West relations in the nuclear age. However we treat our adversary, we must not forget that he inevitably remains our partner too. Right now there is no sensible alternative to a tireless quest for agreements on establishing nuclear arms control.

In other words, despite the efforts of the militarist circles and the propaganda apparatus in their service, awareness of the need to halt the lethal arms race and consideration of the political and military realities existing on our continent are becoming something that increasingly broad circles possess.

FINLAND'S KOIVISTO CITED ON TALKS WITH REAGAN

LD280118 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Washington September 27 TASS -- Speaking to newsmen Tuesday following his talks with U.S. President Reagan, President Mauno Koivisto of Finland emphasized that during the meeting he had expressed his own point of view on the international situation.

Finland's foreign policy, Mauno Koivisto said, was to develop good relations of trust with the neighboring countries, as well as all other countries. He expressed the determination of his country to contribute, within its capabilities, toward restraining international conflicts and promoting a peaceful solution to different problems.

According to informed sources, during the White House talks President Koivisto supported the proposal for setting up a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. This idea is a source of irritation to Washington, as its realization is at a basic variance with the U.S. and NATO plans for the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe.

AUSTRIAN PILOTS REJECT BOYCOTT OF MOSCOW FLIGHTS

PM270822 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Sep 83 p 1

[TASS report: "Rejection of the 'Boycott'"]

[Text] Vienna, 24 Sep -- The Austrian Airlines (AUA) pilots' association has reaffirmed that it does not intend to participate in the "boycott" of flights to Moscow. As is well known, Washington is trying to organize such a boycott by exploiting the "incident" with the South Korean aircraft which invaded the USSR's airspace to carry out special intelligence tasks. In a statement published here the pilots' association cites comments by Austrian Federal Chancellor F. Sinowatz, who has stressed that Austria will not join in the so-called "sanctions" against the Soviet Union. The pilots' association has stressed that the Austrian trade and transport workers' trade union, which represents its interests, supports this government decision.

U.S. RATTLING 'FISTFUL OF ARMS' IN LEBANON

LD272123 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Sep 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Excerpts] From the relatively calm Arab state situated on the coast of the Red Sea, let us transfer ourselves now across the desert expanses of the Arab peninsula to another Arab country on the Mediterranean coast, which has become a symbol of instability. I am speaking, of course, of Lebanon.

While Israel is thinking about what to do next with the occupied part of Lebanon, other foreigners have come to the forefront in Lebanon -- the Americans. It is they who are now doing the shooting. U.S. Marines followed Israeli soldiers into Lebanon, to keep the peace, of course, and just for a brief period. And the first period seemed short indeed. Let us recall that the first 800 American soldiers landed in Beirut at the end of August last year in order to monitor the withdrawal of Palestinian units, and spent less than a month there. Then the Palestinian fighters left and so did the Americans. The cruel and bloody extermination of peaceful inhabitants of the Sabra and Shatila Palestinian camps followed, provoked by the Israeli command.

The Americans returned on 29 September last year, for just a month, it was announced, but instead of a month, a year has gone by. In a few days 1,200 U.S. Marines will be celebrating the first anniversary of their arrival in sunny Lebanon. So that they will not be lonely at this celebration, another 2,000 soldiers of the same type are awaiting their moment aboard American ships near the Lebanese coast.

Now there are more ships than one can count. The battleship "New Jersey" has just joined their flagship -- aircraft-carrier "Eisenhower." The "New Jersey" is carrying monstrous 400-mm or 16-inch guns releasing shells weighing 1.5 metric tons. To date the Americans along the Lebanese coast have been managing with 5-inch weapons. From them, last Monday, 19 September, missile-cruiser "Virginia" and destroyer "John Rodgers" fired 368 shells onto Lebanese territory, according to the count. American observers have called this shelling the largest-scale combat action performed by U.S. naval forces since the times of Vietnam. The guns fired on other days of last week too. Where were the shells aimed? The Americans were shelling the positions of the Druze who were trying to gain control of the town of Suq al-Gharb, 15 km southeast of Beirut.

The Lebanese are shooting each other, striving to reestablish the complicated political, religious, and territorial balance without which peace is impossible in this multicommunity country. Various intermediaries, including Saudi Arabia, are trying to achieve a cease-fire and to stop this civil war which is flaring up again.

What is Washington doing in this delicate situation? It is rattling its fistful of arms. It seems that the Americans want to remake the traditional political balance in Lebanon in their own favor by means of violence. Around 30 American soldiers have been killed or wounded in Lebanon. According to the logic of U.S. imperialism, this is enough to go over to direct armed intervention. What for? To defend American soldiers.

Last week a TASS statement was published on the latest events. It says that in Lebanon the United States has embarked on the road of direct use of armed force on an ever increasing scale. Carrying out armed interference in Lebanon's affairs, the statement says, the Americans want at the same time to intimidate Syria and those forces of the Arab world that refuse to be subordinated to American-Israeli diktat.

Now a few words about the reactions to events taking place on Capitol Hill, in the U.S. Congress. In principle there they have no objection to reshaping Lebanon in U.S. interests. They are frightened, however, by the possible cost. They are also frightened possibly by losses and increasing victims among American soldiers. As a result of discussions between White House and Congress representatives, a compromise was worked out last week which must now be approved by both houses of Congress. The compromise is worded in the following way: The presence of American Marines in Lebanon will be limited to 18 months. The number of Marines, at least on land, will remain as before -- 1,200 -- and their zone of activity will include only Beirut. But the compromise contains a stipulation which reduces it to nothing: The White House may resort to any actions necessary to defend the international peace-keeping forces, including the use of artillery, aviation and increasing the number of Marines. It looks as if the hands of the intervention-lovers remain untied.

Another thing in connection with the situation in Lebanon: A bad example is catching, as they say. France, which has 2,000 soldiers stationed in Lebanon, has also gone over to direct use of armed force. In answer to the shelling of French positions, French planes bombed Beirut suburbs at the end of the week.

U.S.-NATO 'MILITARY FIST' HANGS OVER LEBANON

LD272316 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1850 GMT 26 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] In our news programs we have already told you about the coming into force of the cease-fire agreement in Lebanon. It was achieved as a result of the mediation efforts of Syria and Saudi Arabia and was accepted by the various opposing groups in Lebanon itself. This agreement has been supported by the National Salvation Front, which was founded by such eminent Lebanese figures as Walid Junblatt, Rashid Karami and Sulayman Franjiyah, as well as the influential Shi'ite organization Amal. I would like to make the point that the Shi'ites are one of the most numerous religious-national communities in that country.

The agreement on a cease-fire in Lebanon signifies the beginning of a national dialogue, said Syrian Foreign Minister Abd al-Halim Khaddam in Damascus. We are calling upon all our Lebanese brothers to end the bloodshed and enmity in order to begin the restoration of Lebanon, he emphasized. At the same time, a certain skepticism is being expressed in Western capitals over the stability of this agreement. Neither Reagan nor Shultz, THE WASHINGTON POST writes today, have attempted to predict how long the cease-fire might last or what kind of results it might bring. In his turn, a correspondent of the American ABC television company reports from Damascus that over the last 8 years hundreds of cease-fire agreements have been concluded in Lebanon, and the Lebanese are reacting skeptically to the present agreement. It is not so much, of course, a question of the Lebanese, as of the future behavior of the United States, Israel and the West European NATO countries, whose troops are on Lebanese territory and, by all accounts, have no intention of withdrawing from there.

The firepower of the U.S. ships off the shores of Lebanon was sharply increased with the arrival of the battleship "New Jersey" armed with nine 16-inch guns, an ABC TV correspondent reported from Beirut today, adding that the presence of the battleship "New Jersey" off the Lebanese coast may force the Druze and their allies to observe the conditions of the cease-fire agreement.

The United States is not preparing to withdraw its Marines from Lebanon, which were left there for 18 months, or perhaps even longer, as State Secretary Shultz gave to understand in his recent speech. Thus, the American-NATO military fist still hangs over Lebanon and at the moment it is very difficult to predict the further development of events. As you know, Lebanon Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan resigned in order to ease the process of a national dialogue between the opposing sides in Lebanon and the task to form a new government that would include representatives from all the leading political parties in the country.

Only the future will show whether the cease-fire will turn into a lasting peace and whether Lebanon will achieve the restoration of its sovereignty which was flouted by Israeli and, later, American troops.

SYRIAN SUBUNITS ASKED TO STAY, 'MAINTAIN PEACE'

LD272224 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 27 Sep 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] A tense calm -- that is how a dispatch from Beirut describes Lebanon today.

In spite of isolated incidents the conflicting sides have refrained from resuming combat operations and on the whole are observing the cease-fire agreement which came into force on 26 September. It is being noted in local political circles that, despite the cease-fire agreement, the danger of further U.S. aggression against Lebanon still exists. Even officials in the United States are not hiding this. Secretary of State Shultz stated at a press conference in New York that the mission of the American Marines remains unchanged. At the same time he reaffirmed that, under the pretext of security, the Marines are ready, on first orders to continue to fire upon populated areas of Beirut and other parts of the country. As a result of the latest bloody events in Lebanon, including artillery fire from American warships, more than 800 people have already been killed and over 1,700 injured, the Lebanese press reports today.

A statement by the Lebanese National Salvation Front has been published in Beirut. It points out that the patriotic forces will continue the struggle against the Zionist occupation forces until such time as Tel Aviv renounces its aggressive plans.

Broad circles of the Lebanese public resolutely demand the banishment of the Israeli occupation forces from the country's territory and an end to the military interference of the United States and the NATO countries in Lebanon's internal affairs.

At the same time it is being emphasized that the Syrian subunits in the inter-Arab forces are there at the request of the legitimate Lebanese authorities to maintain peace in that Arab country, and will be withdrawn as soon as the last Israeli soldier has left Lebanese territory.

MUBARAK'S VISIT TO FRANCE, U.S. PREVIEWED

LD272038 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Egyptian President Husni Mubarak has begun an official visit to France and the United States.

Before his visit, the Egyptian press wrote that its basic aims include to coordinate action between Egypt, the United States and France. This report alone sparked off comments in the press of various countries.

It is a well-known fact that France and the United States are active partners in the aggression against Lebanon; both of them have sent their forces and their arms to Chad so as to directly interfere in the internal affairs of that African country. Lastly, both of them are known for waging a rancorous campaign against Libya. This being the case, it is logical to assume that Washington and Paris will try to use Egypt on a large scale for their own interest. In this respect, it is significant that AFP reports from Paris say that during the Egyptian-French talks it was reasserted that both sides adhered to the so-called Reagan plan.

Who does not know that this plan which the U.S. President is trying to implement today denies the Palestinian people's rights to self-determination and to setting up their independent state and it actually gives Tel Aviv endless opportunities to finally annex the occupied Arab territories. Naturally, one cannot judge the results of the Egyptian president's visit to France and the United States until the visit ends and until the final documents are published. However, the first report and comments on this visit indicate that Washington and Paris will do their utmost to make Cairo play a bigger role in their anti-Arab and pro-Israeli policy.

MOSCOW MEETING HONORS EGYPT'S PRESIDENT AN-NASIR

LD280154 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow, September 27 TASS -- A public meeting in memory of Egypt's first presidential Gamal 'Abd an-Nasir was held in Moscow today.

It has been noted that Gamal 'Abd an-Nazir was an outstanding statesman and politician. The gains of the anti-imperialist revolution, the struggle to rid Egypt's economy of foreign domination are associated inseparably with his name.

Gamal 'Abd an-Nasir was a friend of the Soviet Union and did much to strengthen and develop cooperation between the two countries, the speakers have stressed.

USSR, TUNISIAN FOREIGN MINISTRY AIDES CONFER

PM280745 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Sep 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Soviet-Tunisian consultations took place at the USSR Foreign Ministry on 21-22 September on questions of bilateral relations and topical international problems. The participants were, on the Soviet side, L. F. Ilichev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Yu. Ye. Fokin, general secretary of the USSR Foreign Ministry, and, on the Tunisian side, M. Mestiri, Tunisian secretary of state for foreign affairs, and M. H. Gherab, Tunisian ambassador to the USSR.

MOZAMBIQUE REBELS REPORTEDLY RELEASE TWO SOVIETS

AB261201 Paris AFP in English 1156 GMT 26 Sep 83

[Text] Lisbon, Sept. 26 (AFP) -- Mozambique's rebel South African-backed National Resistance Movement (MNR) said today it had released two of 24 Soviet aid workers captured in mid-August with a message for the Maputo government.

An MNR spokesman said the two were freed on September 17 to tell the Mozambican authorities that the remaining 22 would also be let go "immediately (when) Maputo accepts the political conditions already given to it."

The spokesman refused to give details of the conditions, which he said were "confi "confidential."

He added that the Soviet hostages were well, and in a secure MNR base.

The MNR took their prisoners on August 21 in an attack on the gem mines of Morrua, in the northern province of Zambezia. Two other Russians were killed in the raid.

CPSU MESSAGE ON DEATH OF SOUTH AFRICA'S DADOO

PM270823 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the South African Communist Party Central Committee

To the African National Congress of South Africa National Executive Committee

Dear comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee conveys to you deep condolences in connection with the death of Yusuf Dadoo, eminent figure of the African and international communist, workers, and national liberation movement and national chairman of the South African Communist Party.

Yusuf Dadoo was a selfless fighter against imperialism, colonialism, and apartheid, for the national and social liberation of the South African people, and for peace all over the world. He consistently defended the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and the cause of the unity of revolutionary forces. Yusuf Dadoo made a great contribution to the development of friendship and cooperation between the South African and the Soviet peoples.

We ask you to convey our sincere condolences to the family of the deceased.

Yusuf Dadoo's bright memory will live forever in our hearts.

CPSU Central Committee

NIGERIAN TRADE UNION MEMBERS VISIT BAKU

GF271227 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0105 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Summary from poor reception] The president and the secretary general of Nigeria's agricultural trade union, (Amanchuf Votsovodi Nihdeal) and (Halimoye Christopher Olobola) respectively, paid a 3-day visit to Azerbaijan. The guests acquainted themselves with the work of the Azerbaijan council of trade unions, visited the Republic's Ministry of Agriculture and toured interesting sites in Baku.

On 26 September, the guests from Nigeria departed Baku for Ashkhabad.

'CREATIVE DISCUSSION' CRUCIAL IN PARTY MEETINGS

PM271353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "From the Party Meeting's Rostrum"]

[Text] How can we measure the strength of the word resounding from the party meeting's rostrum? Not by outward floridity, of course. The communist's word is strong through the thought behind it aimed at improving the common cause, through the desire to advance this cause and make the greatest possible contribution to it.

Report and election meetings are getting underway increasingly widely in party organizations. Communists are mounting the rostrum one after the other in order to present the results of the work that has been done, to voice their thoughts about what has been done and how, what has failed to materialize and why, and what the prospects are for the future. What a multitude of thoughts is combined and encountered in the process of this party-wide discussion! Over half a million meetings and conferences will be held during the report and election campaign. And it is necessary that they should leave a memorable trace in each party organization, that each statement from the party rostrum should inject a charge of new energy.

The communists from Tambov Oblast's Komsomolets Sovkhoz listened carefully to their comrade, machine operator I. Shelest. He analyzed in detail the benefits of the collective contract for the farm. Labor productivity has increased 50 percent and the prime cost of production has fallen 20 percent. But the worker did not limit himself to only describing the achievements. His thoughts were directed at seeking unutilized reserves and he called for better use to be made of them. He made specific suggestions about what is necessary for this. The resolution of the report and election meeting made this communist's recommendations into a special point.

This is how the party organization is meant to proceed -- from a meaningful statement to a clear-cut militant decision, from word to deed. The task is to ensure a frank, interested, creative discussion of ripe questions, to show concern so that more communists are given an opportunity to share their views, and to share them directly and openly. The entire atmosphere of the exchange of opinions must be subordinated to this.

"The elective party organs must deliver to the meetings and conferences detailed and self-critical reports containing constructive suggestions for improving their entire work," the CPSU Central Committee resolution on the conduct of reports and elections says. "The meetings and conferences themselves must set an example of collective analysis of practical work and emerging problems, of principled mutual exactingness between shortcomings and omissions."

Everything starts, of course, with the report. It sets the tone for the subsequent dialogue. And it is bad if the report's edge is blunted and it fails to name specific names, as if experience is impersonal and criticism anonymous. Given such a start, very few people would feel inclined to speak, and a real discussion is hardly likely to result.

Nevertheless, judging by the letters sent to PRAVDA, people are not everywhere concerned to ensure that the report touches on the most urgent aspects of collective work. Another shortcoming is also coming to light: the advance organization of debates. Some party committees and bureaus strive so hard to arrange everything in advance and compress everything within the framework of the "official" speakers list that it is hard for real initiative to fight its way through this fence of formalism. Communists naturally object to such practices, which contradict the party rules.

"There is no argument that every meeting -- and a report and election meeting in particular -- must be prepared," N. Mironov, CPSU member since 1920, writes from Kiev. "But what does this mean, to prepare? To talk with communists so that they can voice what is on their minds, what concerns them most of all, and to make the rostrum available for just that'. When the report and speeches echo the people's thoughts, the result is a real party dialogue. The drawing up of all kinds of scenarios and pre-edited speeches can create only a semblance of well-being. Such muchings yield little benefit for the state of affairs."

The veteran is right! In its resolution on reports and elections the CPSU Central Committee especially noted the need to bring into action the party's huge reserve -- the further development of internal party democracy and enhancement of communists' creative activity, initiative, and responsibility.

The party member is accountable for the entire state of affairs in his collective. He is not indifferent to either good things or bad. He is pleased at successes, but he does not overlook shortcomings, either. Their principled and critical evaluation helps bring order to all sectors faster. The opposite also applies: the passing over in silence and the conciliatory approach can aggravate the disease and compound the errors.

For example, labor discipline is seriously below standard at the Sirgala open shale pit in Estonia. There are also party members among the violators. How did the report and election party meeting at the stripping sector evaluate all this? Did it call to order those who fail to meet the standards of discipline, who forget their foremost party obligation? No, this matter was mentioned only casually. And party bureau member G. Skamnitskiy even found excuses to justify the violators. Such a position is completely unacceptable.

The efficiency of meetings depends upon the measures which will be taken in response to critical remarks and proposals. They are addressed to different people. Some must be implemented by the actual primary party organization or labor collective. Others need the attention of higher party and economic organs. And today it is important, without putting it off, to take into account and analyze each thought voiced during the report and election campaign and to define and implement specific measures so that nothing that might be useful for the state of affairs is left hanging in the air or buried in protocols.

A communist approaches the rostrum at a report and election meeting .... A responsible moment! The hall is quiet, waiting to hear what the comrade has to say, how he will enrich the collective experience, what new elements he will introduce to the draft resolution. To avoid disappointing these expectations every word must be considered, precise, and effective. Let every word actively influence minds and hearts and inspire people to great accomplishments. And, furthermore, let every speaker be firmly aware: People will listen to and support him. Words must be inevitably followed by action!

GRISHIN ATTENDS MOSCOW CITY SOVIET SESSION

LD272344 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Sep 83

[Text] About 700 production associations and enterprises in Moscow produce consumer goods. The expansion of production of such goods, the improvement of quality and retail trade in the light of the decisions made by the 26th Party Congress and subsequent decisions by the CPSU Central Committee were the subject under discussion at a Moscow city soviet session. The deputies adopted a plan of measures according to which the release of consumer goods will amount to R21 billion during the 11th 5-year plan period.

One of the most important conditions for implementing this program is the reconstruction and technical re-equipping of many enterprises, particularly in the textile and light industries. It was also noted that it is necessary to use raw and other materials and industrial waste more economically. Emphasis was placed on the need to strengthen the business contacts between enterprises and retail shops, and to study consumer demand more accurately. An important role in the organization of this matter is played by the permanent commission production deputies groups and soviet executives.

Viktor Vasilyevich Grishin, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom took part in the session's work.

KAPITONOV MEETS WITH WORKERS IN IVANOVO OBLAST

LD241338 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 24 Sep 83

[Text] Today, at a meeting of the Ivanovo Oblast party organization aktiv, ways of further increasing the production of consumer goods were outlined. Participants in the meeting, noting the constant concern of the party and state for the development of the oblast's light industry, for the improvement of conditions of labor and life of textile workers, concentrated on problems of increasing production, the extension of the range and improvement of the quality of goods.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary Comrade Kapitonov spoke at the meeting. During his stay in Ivanovo Oblast he visited a number of enterprises of light industry, talked with workers and specialists, heads of enterprises, and secretaries of party organizations. Questions of the further improvement of competition, the team form of labor, the organization and stimulation of work were touched upon. In Kineshma Comrade Kapitonov met the electorate.

PRAVDA DECRIES PITFALLS OF CONSUMERISM

PM230924 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 83 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Petrov, deputy chief editor of the journal YALAV, under the rubric "Food For Thought": "What Lies Behind Things"]

[Excerpt] Cheboksary -- How is it that certain people acquire such an unrestrained passion for an abundance of things, for easy luxury, and for excess? It has not come about by chance, being a kind of by-product of the desire to live better than before, the desire to satisfy one's vital needs more fully. It emerged after our realization that working people's wages are increasing year after year, much housing is being built, public funds are growing, and consumer goods production is expanding.

But let us ponder the wise thought expressed at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum that the "rising living standards" formula is sometimes given an oversimplified interpretation, bearing in mind only the growth in the population's income and consumer goods production. In fact, the concept of "living standards" is much boarder and richer. It embraces the constant growth of people's consciousness and culture, including culture of everyday life and behavior and culture of sensible consumption, and the full use of free time from an aesthetic viewpoint.

What does an oversimplified understanding of the rising living standards formula lead to? To certain extremes, materialism and consumerism. Someone with undeveloped taste and without a sense of moderation starts to lose himself in the world of possessions [veshchi]. On seeing a cut glass vase like his neighbor's in a store, he does not resist and buys it. But what for...? Equally, a cumbersome chandelier is not needed in a small room. Carpets on the walls are superfluous, too. But he will acquire all this in the belief that it is fashionable.

From time to time some people are swept up by waves of fashion. A mass passion for antiques gets underway, or a jeans boom suddenly comes along.... Someone who is infected with the virus of materialism does not miss a single one of these fads, afraid of "lagging behind" others. Whether his apartment is cramped or spacious, he buys a wall unit [stenka], preferably an imported one -- which have now become the talk of the town. He starts to hunt for a [tableware] service and for books. Incidentally, for many people even books have now passed from the category of spiritual requirements to the category of scarce commodities.

Sometimes you call at an apartment and it is as though you have entered a warehouse or a secondhand store. But the owner of the things is satisfied. All his anxieties and joys are focused on his possessions -- on buying, cleaning, and repairing them.

The aspect of the petit bourgeois acquires its own features in every epoch. As the viruses of epidemics adapt to the conditions of the changing environment, so he too adjusts to the needs and tastes of his own time. And you cannot recognize him straightaway, for he has many faces. He is a "lover" of sport who does not miss a single television broadcast of a hockey or soccer match. Or he is a music lover rousing his neighbor to a fury with his ultramodern stereo apparatus. Try to say to him: That is not the way to live. He always has the same answer: "My home is my concern." In fact, so it is. Somehow it is not customary to interfere in cultivating the tastes and requirements of neighbors or comrades at work. If he likes to amass possessions and money, let him do so, so long as he lives and works honestly, we sometimes argue. But someone disposed to hoard gradually becomes a slave to his possessions and "contracts" social apathy.

No, bourgeois philistinism is not harmless, and we are not indifferent to it. Someone with a passion for the pursuit of fashion and scarce commodities frequently begins also to overstep the norms of morality and the law. He employs the notorious worldly principle "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" and resorts to direct deception and eyewash.

I still recall with bitterness and indignation a tragic case which occurred several years ago in the forest settlement of Buinsk. One evening a tenth-grader from the local school was going to an eighth-graders' graduation party with his female schoolmates. On passing Yefimov's house the lad remembered that the owner grows flowers in his garden. They also grew flowers at his own home. Only he did not want to return home. And he had a very great desire to present the girls with fresh flowers. Carried away by a somewhat frivolous passion, he perpetrated what is generally an unlawful act: He climbed over Yefimov's garden fence. He returned a few minutes later, walking with a strangely reeling gait. The girls supported him on both sides. And he began to sink before their eyes. Andrey did not live until dawn but died in the settlement hospital from loss of blood following knife wounds.

The deceased had been an excellent pupil up to the eighth grade. He participated in school and rayon physics and mathematics competitions. He loved technology and dreamed of entering Odessa Nautical College on graduating from school. He was keen on sports and did not shun homework.

Now let us look at what sort of man Yefimov was. There seem to be no blemishes on his biography. He worked on the railroad, first as a senior switchman, then as a fitter. He was dependable and did not enter into conflicts with the chiefs. Sometimes he received bonuses and thanks. Who would have thought that such an irreproachable worker could commit such a grave crime? But people in the service did not know what passion was gnawing at his soul or discern in him an avaricious owner and hoarder.

Yefimov had never gone away on vacation or left his home on his days off and was always concerned about his house and garden. He cut himself off from his neighbors behind such a very high fence that a hen could not fly over it. I do not wish to reproach Yefimov with being house-proud, diligent, and thrifty, but when these generally positive qualities serve cupidity they become harmful and dangerous to one's associates. The passion for profit had dried up and laid waste the soul of this man.

Of course, this is a rare and exceptional case of the fall of someone who turned his property into a kind of idol. But, of course, it is not these people with spiritual anomalies who determine our Soviet way of life. I know many truly generous, selfless people who are ready at any moment to help a person, people with an active life stance and with healthy enthusiasms and requirements which benefit not only themselves but also others.

At the Chuvash Republic Peace Defense Committee they will cite you hundreds of examples of disinterestedness. People send the committee money they have earned and transfer it for free to the Peace Fund. You will certainly be told about S.M. Yefimova, a participant in the Great Patriotic War, who has paid more than R5,000 into the Peace Fund. They will tell you how party veteran A.A. Gorskaya has been paying R10 a month out of her own modest pension into this nationwide kitty for more than 10 years now. Workers in Cheboksary enterprises frequently work a peace vigil as entire teams....

I cannot enumerate the deeds and names of those who are prepared at any moment to sacrifice this own good for the sake of others' happiness, for the motherland's prosperity, for peace and tranquillity on earth. These people have a person's most valuable asset -- generosity of soul, selfless goodness, and high social activeness. Fortunately, human fraternity is maintained, above all, by them, by such people.

TAMBOV OBLAST CONSUMER SERVICES UNDER FIRE

PM230954 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Sep 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The work of the consumer services in Tambov Oblast is giving rise to justified rebukes from the population. An analysis of the activity of this important sector has shown that the targets for the 10th 5-Year Plan and the first 2 years of the 11th 5-Year Plan for the sale of consumer services here have been underfulfilled, the capital investments earmarked for the consolidation of the material and technical base are not being assimilated, and industrial enterprises are not being adequately enlisted in the expansion of consumer service production areas. For many types of services per capita, especially the repair of domestic appliances, radio and television apparatus, clothing, footwear, and furniture, the oblast's consumer services are lagging considerably behind the RSFSR indicators. The status of services for the rural population is particularly disturbing.

Analyzing the reasons for the prevailing situation, the PSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium stressed that the standard of the oblispolkom's work to develop consumer services for the population fails to accord with the requirements of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum. Many omissions in the sector's work became possible because the oblispolkom failed to establish proper control over the implementation of the decisions taken on consumer services for the population. The responsibility of the local soviet oblispolkoms and leaders of consumer service management organs and enterprises for the consolidation of the sector's material and technical base, improving the quality of the fulfillment of orders and the standard of services to the population, and for the results of economic activity is being increased only feebly.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium has ordered Tambov Oblispolkom to eliminate existing shortcomings in the development of consumer services.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium session also heard about a number of other questions, including the progress of the harvest and grain procurements on RSFSR kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the results of the fulfillment of the industrial production plan in January through August 1983.

The session was led by V.I. Vorotnikov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

LATVIAN SENTENCED FOR 'ANTISTATE' ACTIVITY

LD241131 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0950 GMT 24 Sep 83

[Text] Riga, 24 Sep (TASS) -- The open trial has ended in the Latvian capital of Ints Calitis, accused of antistate activity and of directly calling for the overthrow of the system established by the will of the working people of Latvia and embodied in the Constitution.

His criminal activity was fully and incontrovertibly established in the course of investigation and during the trial, by the testimony of witnesses, material proofs, and the statements of the accused.

The path that led Calitis to the dock was a logical one. The spirit of a fascist outlook reigned in the family in which he grew up. His father, Maksis Calitis, and his brothers Juris and Eduard, besmirched themselves with bloody crimes against the Soviet people. In the years before the war, on the instructions of the Abwehr, they formed the sabotage and intelligence organization Tevijas Sargi which, together with the police battalions formed by the German occupiers, dealt brutally with Soviet citizens. Having enlisted as a volunteer with the notorious "team" of Arajs -- later sentenced to life imprisonment by a West German court for war crimes -- Eduard Calitis, among other things, took part in punitive operations in the region of Vilnius, Idritsa, and Sebezh, which claimed the lives of nearly 30,000 peaceful civilians.

For what they did during the war years and in the postwar period the criminal brothers were given the punishment they deserved.

Ints Calitis too followed the road of the fascist accomplices. At the end of the forties he was still trying to organize an armed gang with the aim of killing Soviet people. But blood did not flow: Calitis was exposed in time and found guilty.

Having served his sentence he again decided to return to criminal activities, but was again taken in hand.

One should not fail to take note of the humaneness displayed by the Soviet authorities. Calitis' sentence was considerably reduced. He was given the chance to complete his secondary education and acquire a qualification. On his release he and his family were given a well-appointed five-room apartment in the center of Riga.

In 1977, when it became known that Calitis had resumed his antistate activities, he was twice warned about the possibility of legal proceedings. The lessons did him no good.

The Supreme Court of the Latvian SSR sentenced Ints Calitis to 6 years' deprivation of freedom.

POLITICAL OBSERVER'S TALKS ON TECHNICAL PROGRESS

LD270134 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1355 GMT 24 Sep 83

["Political Observer's Talk" program presented by political observer Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy with Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Shkabardnya, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of instrument making, automation equipment and control system]

[Excerpts] [Voznesenskiy] Hello, comrades: Today we will present for your attention a broadcast dealing with a question of exceptional topical importance for the entire life of our country: The question of scientific and technical progress and its acceleration. Everyone knows that the main path for the development of the Soviet economy and of the whole of our society in the near future is the path of intensifying social production, the path of raising its efficiency in every possible way. Scientific and technical progress is the central point and the central direction in all of this work. On the rate of this progress depend to an immense and decisive extent both the rate of development of the Soviet economy and of the whole of our society in the near future in the path of intensifying social production, the path of raising its efficiency in every possible way. Scientific and technical progress is the central point and the central direction in all of this work. On the rate of this progress depend to an immense and decisive extent both the rate of development for social production and, consequently, the rate of our entire social porgress.

We will begin this broadcast with an interview with Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and academician.

[Marchuk] Dear comrades! A decision concerning the further development of scientific and technical progress in our country recently came out by the CPSU Central Committee and the government. Following the November Plenum of the Central Committee, the June Plenum and the speech by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov on the need to put the economy onto an intensive path of development, this decision places before the entire Soviet people a new task of extraordinary importance: that of achieving within the next few years the highest possible technical level of output produced. It is a program for the realization of those fundamental decisions which were adopted at the Central Committee plenums. I would like to draw attention to the fact that a very important point in this decision is the changeover by our country to the program-specific [programmnotselevoy] method of planning the development of the national economy, particularly scientific and technical progress, in the spirit of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. The types of programs which very precisely direct the development of our country toward solving concrete problems of science, technical methods and ultimately technology have been defined here. First of all, it is an all-union program of scientific and technical progress, that is most important.

[Voznesenskiy] Guriy Ivanovich, if my memory serves me correctly, we are carrying out 170 complex scientific programs during the current 5-year plan. Could you name just some of them?

[Marchuk] During the current 5-year plan we have done a great deal -- there were special instructions from the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers in this connection - to organize inter-industry state programs of scientific and technical progress.

These are specific programs, programs which are oriented toward solving problems of the kind that ought to have been simultaneously picked up by many industries and by the whole national economy in general. What kind of programs are these? There is, for example, a program for anticorrosion coverings. This is a program which affects all industries, it affects mechanisms and machines, chemical engineering, agricultural production and so on.

[Voznesenskiy] Fulfillment of this program will make it possible for us to save several million tons of metal.

[Marchuk] Of course, and not only that. The main thing that we can do is not just to have economic machines, but more reliable ones. Reliability and economy, reduction of the amount of metal used -- these are all questions which are linked very closely together. Take, for example, the program for the development of atomic power generation. This is a program in which many industries of the national economy are involved, and, of course, it is one that can be accomplished only by the country as a whole.

We talk a great deal about the mechanization of manual labor. This is a very large problem which we are undoubtedly solving. And I would like to say that complex mechanization, complex automatization, is the general path by which we shall ultimately solve this problem. Simultaneously, it is also proposed that beginning with the 12th 5-year plan, programs for scientific and technical progress relating to particular industries be examined in all industries in the national economy. This is something new. We have the possibility to coordinate all-union, so to speak, inter-industry problems with the problems that arise within the industries of the national economy and which are of great importance in the general complex of tasks.

But this is not all. Here, one might say, there is planning, specific, program planning, on the vertical plane -- from the state, the industry, to the enterprise. A new tractor has to be created, say, powder metallurgy has to be introduced, laser have to be used, and so on. But in addition to this, there are union republican programs. I think that now is the first time that a great role has been given, by this decision, in such a serious and large-scale way to scientific and technical progress achieved by all enterprises, industries, and national economies of the union republics.

Finally, the last thing is the creation of the so-called regional programs for scientific and technical progress: The West Siberian complex; in the future, the Kansk-Achinsk complex; possibly the Kola Peninsula, and all its problems connected with the use of resources; and the Siberia program. In a word, we are now witnesses to the way in which the planning matrix, so to speak, is coming into being -- that is to coordinate planning on the vertical plane with planning region by region. And in this state plan of ours, on its qualitative side, in its optimum combination of general tasks of the national economy with the tasks which arise locally -- in this lies its strength and the ability for initiative to be displayed at any level in our structure. Our industry turns out an enormous quantity of products. It is, of course, impossible to keep one's eye on this from the center, nor is it expedient to do so.

[Voznesenskiy] On the whole of this variety.

[Marchuk] Of course. Therefore, the priority directions, which will indeed create the foundation of our production and which will operate most actively upon the development of industry and so on, have to be singled out. And the whole of the remainder must be distributed locally, to a considerable extent, in order to supplement the tasks of the whole state and to produce equipment and objects -- both for consumption and objects which are needed for life in general and for the national economy as a whole -- on the basis of initiative [v initsiativnom poryadke]

Indeed, this can give an additional, major effect in terms of the national economy. It will give that thing that most mass production has. Take, for example, a tractor. Tractors are turned out by the hundred thousand. Take a combine. We cannot manage without them. They are an integral part of the structure of agricultural production. But they, too, are need by the ten thousand and the hundred thousand. If we make these tractors, combines, refrigerators and television receivers good ones -- that is good in the sense that they must be light, that they consume little power, that they are reliable, long-lasting, and good in operation -- then we will save immense resources for society. In this way we can bring up other industries with what has been saved and back them up. This is very important.

It is precisely for this very reason that the party and government are aiming our organizations primarily toward output which has mass significance. But in order to make this output good and economical, to ensure that it really does come up to the highest standards -- the highest world standards -- in order to do this, then equipment is needed which will make it possible to make this equipment, this output, the best. The second component of the most important output, therefore, is equipment by whose aid we must re-equip, reconstruct, and refurbish our production, particularly where broad, wide, mass output is concerned.

Finally, in order to establish this production -- of equipment -- it is essential that rolling mills, unique convertors, unique electric furnaces, be created of the kind that will make it possible to create this type of equipment and to obtain the necessary metal, the necessary [word indistinct], the necessary materials, composites, and so on. And here the circle of the most important products of the national economy closes. As you see, it is perfectly clear, it is extremely clear from the logical point of view. And if now, through this tractor, or this combine, or this machine-tool which will make the combine, or the technoligically flexibly readjustable robotized line, if this enters our life from the standpoint of the most important output -- which consists of a large quantity of parts which go together to make up the whole -- then they will tie in other industries, other enterprises, many enterprises. Therefore, there is a kind of pyramid, the technical level of the final product of which drags along behind it perhaps two-thirds of the whole national economy. This is a very big, serious strategic task: to single out this output which is of the most important significance for the national economy.

[Voznesenskiy] Guriy Ivanovich, it is essential for this that yet another link should be raised to a new level, the link engaged in the planning of these, so to speak, machines and mechanisms and everything concerned in the means of production. That is to say, if we take output for the consumer and go up by the steps which you have proposed in your thinking, then we reach the necessity of further improving the link which was the starting point, that is the say, science and its practical application.

[Marchuk] You are perfectly correct. In all of this, of course, an outstanding role is played by fundamental research and applied science. Fundamental research makes it possible to look into the future and to find the kinds of new ideas which, after having been further worked on and with the help of technology, will ultimately enter widescale production and create completely new conditions for raising our social production and, in the first place and particularly, for raising labor productivity.

[Voznesenskiy] And now comrades, we are in the Soviet section of the Nauka-83 international exhibition. On display is a wide range of instruments and means of automatization, machines not just for industry and other branches of the national economy, but for carrying out scientific experiments, without which present-day science cannot develop, and without which scientific and technical progress cannot advance and exist.

We have asked Mikhail Sergeyevich Shkabardnya, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of instrument making, automation equipment and control systems, to speak about these problems.

[Shkabardnya] An important ingredient in scientific and technical progress is automation -- the automation of any production process, of control processes and scientific experiments. At the moment, Lev Aleksandrovich, we are standing next to a modern computer complex, which has been built on the basis of current microprocessor technology, and which makes it possible to solve a number of very important problems in the production processes of mineral fertilizer.

[Voznesenskiy] Mikhail Sergeyevich, if I understand correctly, the purpose of this complex then is to solve the problem of optimizing the composition of mineral fertilizer.

[Shkabardnya] Lev Aleksandrovich, you are absolutely right. And if we are speaking about computer complexes, then in general one can say that computer equipment in automated control systems has as its main purpose the optimization of the process -- of course, optimization on a broad basis, optimizing labor used, energy consumed, and other important...

[Voznesenskiy interrupts] And the quality of the output.

[Shkabardnya] And the quality of production, of course. It must be said that in industry, particularly where units of high capacity are concerned, the processes, as a rule, take place very rapidly. An enormous number of parameters have to be controlled. It would be simply unthinkable today for a human operator to cope with this task efficiently without computer equipment. Furthermore, computer technology makes it possible to carry out work under criticial working conditions.

[Voznesenskiy] Which is, at the same time, the most advantageous.

[Shkabardnya] It is the most efficient, of course. Currently the most important thing from our point of view is the development of machine-building, having in mind the most active and efficient influence that this subsequently has upon all the industries within the national economy. I do not think that I shall be exaggerating much if I say that robotization is, in my view, our national task. Robotization of itself, of course, demands present-day control equipment. It demands modern equipment, designed with the direct use of computer control equipment, and ultimately solving the main task of releasing people in a number of cases from tiresome labor, of raising labor productivity, of reducing energy costs and so on.

We are doing a great deal of work in this direction at the moment. Devices for numerical program control [ustroystva chislovogo programmnogo upravleniya] and robots have been created for current technical purposes. Work is being carried out to create control technology for flexible production operations. We have a special program for creating and introducing robots and manipulators and robot technological complexes. This program is envisaged for the years 1982-1986 and concerns the working out and introduction of more than 30,000 robots within the framework of our industry alone. I would like to give as an example the assembly of clock mechanisms at the Petrodvorets Watch and Clock Works. There we have created a robotized workshop. We have been able to release more than 1,000 assembly workers, in nominal figures. I am able to say that last year we manufactured more than 3 million clock mechanisms in that shop, thanks to the use of robot technological lines.

We have other positive examples, too, in Leningrad. We have now completed the complex robotization of a press shop. We have completed this task efficiently. In my view, robots have now left the pages of the science fiction novels we used to read with great interest and have, in practical terms entered the workshops and the production facilities. I would say that they are performing their service in a worthy manner.

[Voznesenskiy] To the service of man.

[Shkabardnya] The service of man.

[Voznesenskiy] Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have said that robots are already giving a certain return. Could you say a few words about how economically advantageous robotization is, or speak about the economic problems that exist at this stage of robotization?

[Shkabardnya] As I have already said, through the introduction of 30,000 robot-manipulators, we expect that a minimum of 45,000 people will be released in nominal figures. We consider that this is already a sufficiently good effect. It means that costs are quickly paid back. But it also has to be said that a number of important social questions are solved. For one thing, people are freed from tiresome operations. In addition to this we have the opportunity to improve the use of the capacities of our production. The robot can work three shifts without a break, so to speak; and if days off are required, then that, of course, is our task -- to create production facilities that can be switched on and off. We have in mind here the carrying out of periodic maintenance routines. This is very real.

In our program we have the task of out the complex automatization of the First and Second Watch and Clock Works upon a basis of robot technological complexes. We have to complete this work in full by 1987. But the most agreeable thing about it, I would say, they have overcome the psychological feeling of fear of the new and the unfamiliar. At the Automation-83 international exhibition this year we have been showing parts of the robot technological complexes for the assembly of clocks at the Second Watch and Clock Works, where, at each control desk, we release eight assembly workers.

The introduction of instruments and automation systems in the agro-industrial complex is a separate problem at the present time. This is an extremely important task. In our industry, following the May Plenum, we examined very closely the problems with all the industries which have gone into the agro-industrial complex. We have worked out joint programs for the current 5-year plan and for the period up to 1990. These programs provide for the solution of a number of issues, I would say, of principle, linked with the fact that an immense program for land improvement and for irrigation is currently being carried out in our country. It is a colossal program which must have an enormous effect in lifting the fertility of the land.

[Voznesenskiy] This problem was examined recently at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

[Shkabardnya] Quite right, yes. We have carried out an enormous volume of work with the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. We have prepared scientific and technical concepts for the automatization of the production processes. At the present time, planning for a number of types of apparatus has been completed. In particular, next year we intend to create complex automated pumping stations in places where tens of thousands of people are now engaged in servicing them round the clock, and so on. Present-day equipment is making it possible to run these stations in practical terms merely with periodic servicing.

During the current 5-year period we intend to increase the volume of production of instruments and automation equipment for the agro-industrial complex by at least 2.5 to 3 times. I consider this to be a great contribution on our part. I now have no doubt that we shall cope with this task during the current 5-year period.

But there is one other point, Lev Aleksandrovich. I would like to say that in connection with the colossal extension of the area in which they are used, there is, of course, one very important task -- I am deeply convinced of this -- and that is that we must find ways of increasing the volume of production -- and increasing production substantially -- of modern computer equipment, control equipment and automation equipment. We are looking for ways in which we can develop our capacities. Of course, we need help from Gosplan in the solution of a number of these questions. But this is inevitable. It is not so much a question of whether we all make definite contributions together to the development of capacities today and obtain the effect more quickly. In my view we shall do this whether or not, sooner or later; but we shall lose time and the economic effect of the return.

BRIEFS

SHIP FOR GREECE -- The Leninist Komsomol ship-building association in Kherson has completed all trials of mechanisms, instruments, and the main diesel engine on one more tanker built for a Greek shipping company. The new tanker, The Athenian Beauty, will shortly leave Kherson for its home port. This is the sixth ship of the ordered series, built for the Greek shipping company in Kherson. All the ships built are of remarkably high quality and meet existing international requirements. [Summary] [Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0645 GMT 15 Sep 83 AU]

EQUIPMENT SHOW IN KIEV -- The second international specialized show of modern equipment, instruments, and packaging materials for the meat and dairy industry opened in the premises of the Ukrainian Exhibition of National Economic Achievements in Kiev on 13 September with the participation of nearly 170 firms from 14 countries. According to Vitaliy Konstantinovich Solomakha, Ukrainian minister of the meat and dairy industry, in 1983 Ukrainian stockbreeders have been working well. They have already procured for the state significantly more meat and milk than last year. This enabled the republic's meat and dairy industry to supply R197.5-million worth of goods in excess of the plan. The 800 enterprises of the republic's meat and dairy industry are now employing more than 200,000 workers. State capital investments in the branch development are great. The industry has good relations with Hungarian firms supplying equipment to cheese-manufacturing plants, and with Czechoslovak firms. It is expected that the show will help conclude mutually favorable contracts with other firms. [Summary] [Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0745 GMT 13 Sep 83 AU]

MID-SEPTEMBER WEATHER, CROP STATUS REVIEWED

PM271008 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 24 Sep 83 p 2

[USSR Hydrometeorological Center report by agrometeorologist N. Sakharova: "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] In the second 10-day period of September the mild weather continued in most of the regions of the USSR's European territory. West of a line running through Vologda, Ivanovo, Kaluba, Kharkov, and Zaporozhye the average air temperature over the 10 days was 2-5 degrees above normal. It was cool in the Volga-Vyatka, Volga, and Ural Regions. The heaviest rainfall was in Moldavia, the west Ukraine, Belorussia, the Baltic republics, the Northwest region, and the Urals.

On European territory conditions for carrying out field and harvesting operations were favorable. Winter grain crops in the majority of regions developed with a sufficient supply of warmth and moisture. In the majority of oblasts in the Northwest, Central, and Volga-Vyatka regions and the northeast of the Volga region winter crops sown in late August and early September have begun to form tillering nodes. Crops sown later were at the shoot and third leaf stage.

In the arable farming regions of West Siberia and the larger part of Kazakhstan the cold weather persisted. The average air temperature was 2-4 degrees below normal. Frosts were noted everywhere (from 0 to minus 5 degrees in the air and from minus 6 to minus 8 on the ground). Rain fell for 4-7 days in the majority of oblasts in West Siberia and a number of regions in Kustanay, North Kazakhstan, Kokchetav, Pavlodar, Tselinograd, Turgay, Semipalatinsk, and East Kazakhstan Oblasts. In the last days of the 10-day period sleet fell in the majority of West Siberian oblasts and in places a temporary snow mantle formed. There were interruptions in agricultural crop harvesting. Winter rye sown in West Siberia before 20 August has thickened out.

The cool weather persisted in the arable farming regions of Krasnoyarsk Kray and Irkutsk Oblast. It was milder than usual in the Transbaykal. Fronts were noted almost everywhere.

In Central Asia and South Kazakhstan favorable conditions for the growth and ripening of cotton bolls persisted in the first 3-4 days of the 10 days. Then, following a sharp drop in temperature and some rainfall, they deteriorated. The lower temperature reduced the efficiency of defoliants and the rain held up defoliation and picking of the raw cotton. At the end of the 10 days the air temperature rose and conditions improved for the ripening of the bolls and the harvesting of the raw cotton.

'MAJOR VICTORY' IN KUYBYSHEV GRAIN DELIVERY

LD272045 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 27 Sep 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] As the USSR Central Statistical Administration has reported, Kuybyshev Oblast agricultural workers have won a major labor victory. The oblast's kolkhozes and sovkhozes have delivered to state granaries 1.8 million tons of grain, which is 400,000 tons above plan. State plans for purchase of all grain crops, including wheat, millet, buckwheat and pulses, have been fulfilled. Farms of the oblast have fully provided themselves with grain crop seed for next year's harvest.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY MINISTER ON DEVELOPMENT PLANS

LD280849 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 28 Sep 83

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS -- The production facilities put into operation at the Tomsk chemical works (Siberia) will make it possible to ensure a considerable increase in the Soviet Union's output of methanol, a raw material for the production of synthetic resins, fibres and plastics. The construction of the new production facilities is envisaged by the guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR for the current five-year plan period (1981-1985) and up to 1990.

The works in Tomsk is of great significance for the development of many branches of the economy, a TASS correspondent was told by Vladimir Listov, USSR minister of the chemical industry. On the basis of the polymer granules made at the works production will be started at other mills and factories in Siberia of film, plastic pipes, insulation material, structural elements, parts of radio and tv sets, cars and trucks, ships, machine tools and other machinery.

The USSR chemical industry ranks first in Europe and second in the world in its total output, the minister pointed out. Along with the power, metallurgical, machine building and other industries, it sets the pace for technical progress in the country's national economy. Over the two years of the five year plan period (1981-1985) the volume of output grew seven percent as compared with 1980, big facilities have been put into service for the production of caustic soda, polystyrene, benzene and ethylene. The output has been increased of chemical fibres, glass-reinforced plastics, dies and varnishes.

The workers of the industry are to resolve important tasks within the next two years. In this five year plan period the volume of output in the chemical and petrochemical industry is to be increased by almost a third. To implement the tasks, a programme is being carried out for putting into service new industrial facilities and modernization of the existing ones. Before the end of the five year plan period it is planned to create at the works of the industry 70 industrial robots and manipulators. Three quarters of the whole of the Soviet Union's chemical industry output will be ensured at the mills and factories with automated control systems.

The high rates of development in the industry, the minister continued, necessitates keenest attention to environmental protection. Already now, not a single chemical works is put into service without its purification installations being prepared. The industry invests considerable funds into nature protection. This item accounts for nearly ten percent of all capital investments in industry. But a simple increase in appropriations cannot resolve all problems. Therefore low-waste and waste-free technology are introduced at the mills and factories of the industry. A comprehensive plan for improving conditions of work is steadily implemented. In the current five year plan period, in particular it is planned to modernise more than 200 production facilities and close 100 chemical workshops, where conditions of work do not correspond to the present-day standards, the minister said.

MILITARY COUNCIL'S SHEVKUN SPEAKS ON PROPAGANDA

PM280900 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian in its 27 September First Edition publishes on page 2, as part of a full-page feature under the general heading "Fulfilling Pledges Completely, Completing the Training Year Worthily," a 1,400-word interview with Lieutenant General N. Shevkun, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Southern Group of Forces, by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Malygin under the heading "Filling With Lofty Meaning."

Shevkun claims that "some commanders, political workers and party organizations are concerned only with what I would call the procedural aspect of competition," while forgetting about socialist competition in daily life. He goes on to emphasize that "the political aspect of socialist competition must unfailingly be revealed to people, especially the young," and that this can best be achieved through the improvement of agitation and propaganda work. In particular, Shevkun describes how in a recent talk with servicemen there was discussion "of the act of provocation on our Far Eastern borders, of the shameless anti-Soviet propaganda which the U.S. Administration mounted. The soldiers had already gained a deep understanding of how the forces of reaction are exploiting the incident with the South Korean aircraft to disrupt the relaxation of international tension and to extort new funds for preparing war. And this talk left a special mark on the entire working day."

MARSHAL PETROV INTERVIEWED ON TANK TROOPS DAY

PM270908 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 83 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Hero of the Soviet Union, Marshal of the Soviet Union V.I. Petrov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, by an unnamed PRAVDA correspondent: "Steel Guard: Today Is Tank Troops Day"; date and place not given -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] On the eve of the holiday Hero of the Soviet Union Marshal of the Soviet Union V.I. Petrov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, replied to questions from a PRAVDA correspondent.

[PRAVDA correspondent] In the postwar years and particularly in the last three decades, the USSR Armed Forces have undergone considerable changes, including structural changes. New categories of troops and even branches of the Armed Forces have been created. How has this affected the development of the Ground Forces?

[V.I. Petrov] The Ground Forces have been and remain on the main axis of the defense of the country and our allies from encroachment by any aggressor. But we have experienced changes too, especially in armaments and equipment. The Ground Forces today have formidable missiles, multipurpose rapid combat vehicles, antiaircraft missile and self-propelled artillery complexes, and sophisticated control and communications facilities.

All this has sharply increased the Ground Forces' combat potential, mobility, and maneuverability. As the largest branch of the Armed Forces and the most diverse in armaments and technical equipment, they are capable of fulfilling major strategic tasks to crush the enemy both in conjunction with other branches of the Armed Forces and independently.

[Correspondent] Has the role of the tank troops not been forgotten in this diversity of potential?

[Petrov] No, they are still the main strike force of the Ground Forces even today, a reliable shield in defense and a telling sword in attack, for the modern tank is superior to its predecessors in terms of all the main tactical and technical characteristics and has, in addition, potential which was not even conceived of before.

The combat vehicles with which the country's tank builders provide the troops today, have reliable armored protection, a long range, and sophisticated driving and control instruments, are capable of hitting moving armored and other targets at long range and at the first attempt, and can cross, without stopping, extensive areas of radioactive contamination and water obstacles.

It must be added that the tank troops today are also composed of motorized infantry, missile, artillery, air defense, and other subunits. This makes it possible to make even more effective use of tanks' combat potential.

[Correspondent] Equipment has become more complex, and that means the demands on the people who use it have increased. What qualities does a tankman need today?

[Petrov] To put it bluntly, service in the modern tank troops is not easy. You need to know and master a great deal, for every tankman deals with a whole range of complicated devices, instruments, modern communications facilities, and several types of weapons. In order to master such a machine and make full use of the combat potential it possesses, each tankman must have several special ties, be master of his job, have solid skills in using the equipment, possess lofty moral and psychological tempering, be physically hardy, and capable of maintaining activeness, boldness, determination, and an unbreakable will for victory in real combat. That is not all. The tank is a collective weapon and therefore requires precise, coordinated, and at the same time enterprising actions from all members of the crew.

These qualities are acquired by tankmen in daily intensive combat training. Under the commanders' leadership and with a sophisticated training material base at their disposal, they learn to drive combat vehicles skillfully and to shoot accurately in any -- including the most complex -- conditions.

The existing high standard of education and technical competence today help the young soldiers to master their combat specialty in quite a short time and to become full members of the tank crews and army collectives. In the Red Banner Transbaykal Military District, for instance, the tank company commanded by Guards Captain V.I. Tulskiy is well known. The guards are stepping up their efforts with every passing day in the struggle for quality and effectiveness in training. For 4 years the company has retained its title of excellent company. In one of the companies of the Kantemirov Guards Division, whose roster includes forever Heroes of the Soviet Union Junior Lieutenant A. Hermolayev and Sergeant A. Timofeyev, the initiative "Shoot like Yermolayev and drive tanks like Timofeyev" is alive and assuming increasing practical value with every passing year. There are several similar examples in every district and in every tank formation and unit.

[Correspondent] How are Soviet tankmen celebrating their holiday?

[Petrov] This year Tank Troops Day is being celebrated in an atmosphere of intensive work by Soviet people to fulfill the decisions of the 26th Party Congress, the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums, the 8th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the plans of the 11th 5-year Plan.

Servicemen, including tankmen, are also working well. Socialist competition under the slogan: "Heighten vigilance and reliably ensure the motherland's security!" has been widely disseminated among the tank troops. Communists are the stalwarts of socialist competition. Komsomol members and all servicemen try to emulate them.

The tankmen are concentrating their efforts on the trouble-free operation of equipment and increasing the interval between overhauls, on increasing cruise speeds, on the complete interchangeability of crew members, on saving fuel and lubricants, and on heightening in every way vigilance, organization, and combat readiness.

Among those that have distinguished themselves we can cite the Red Banner Order of Lenin Order of Kutuzov G.I. Kotovskiy Proskurov-Berlin Guards Tank Regiment, the initiator of socialist competition in the Ground Forces, and the four-times order-bearing Guards Tank Regiment commanded by Guards Lieutenant Colonel V.V. Bulgakov.

"Being a patriot today," the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum noted, "means tirelessly strengthening our motherland's economic and defense potential, increasing our readiness to defend peace from any encroachments by the imperialist aggressor, and treating military duties conscientiously." In the present conditions, when reactionary imperialist circles, primarily U.S. imperialists, by their aggressive policy are pushing mankind to the verge of nuclear catastrophe and calling for a "crusade" against communism, we Soviet servicemen are faced with the clear, noble, and specific task of tirelessly increasing vigilance and combat readiness and reliably defending the inviolability of the borders of the motherland and of the socialist community countries.

Soviet servicemen, including tankmen, are fulfilling this task with honor.